This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

OYLE

What is Socialism?

An Exposition and a Criticism

With Special Reference to the Movement in America and England

BY

JAMES BOYLE

Private Secretary of Gov. Wm. McKinley; former Consul of the United States at Liverpool, Eng.

Author of "The Initiative and Referendum," "Organized Labor and Court Decisions," "The New Socialism," etc.

THE SHAKESPEARE PRESS
114-116 E. 28th Street
NEW YORK
1912

Soc 751.21



Wolcott fund

COPYRIGHT, 1912,

BY

JAMES BOYLE.

I dedicate this book to

My Wife,

Whose patience and encouragement have been of immeasurable value to me in my studies.

"Socialism is so vague and contradictory that it cannot stand argument. Its very vagueness commends it to men who will not or cannot take the trouble to think, but in the long run the men who do think will win, if the discussion is only kept up."—HENRY GEORGE, in letter to the Editor of the *Financial Reform Almanac,* Liverpool, Eng.

"Class war is murder; class war is fratricide; class war is suicide."—CHARLES BRADLAUGH (the English Radical), in his debate with H. M. Hyndman, the leader of British Marxian Socialism.

"I want to tell you Socialists that . . . economically, you are unsound; socially, you are wrong; industrially, you are an impossibility."—SAMUEL GOMPERS, President of the American Federation of Labor, at the annual meeting, at Boston, 1903.

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD 13

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION 15
- TWO REMARKABLE PRONOUNCEMENTS 15
- SOCIALISM IN ENGLAND 15
- RELATION TO RELIGION AND MORALITY 17
- VARIATIONS AND AGREEMENTS 20
- IN AMERICA 22
- IS REVOLUTION IMMINENT? 24
- LABOR AND SOCIALISM 25
- DEVELOPMENTS IN AMERICA 26
- SOCIALISM ALREADY HERE! 29
- ROBERT OWEN, THE FATHER OF MODERN SOCIALISM . 30

CHAPTER II

WHAT IS SOCIALISM? 34
- ORIGIN OF THE WORD "SOCIALISM" 34
- DEFINITIONS 34
- WHAT IS "ORTHODOX" SOCIALISM? 39
- NOT ANARCHISM, NOR COMMUNISM 42
- DIVISION OF LABOR'S PRODUCTS 45

CHAPTER III

IN ANCIENT DAYS 49
- ABORIGINAL COMMUNISM 49
- THE FAMILY AND PRIVATE PROPERTY 50

Examples of Ancient Socialism 54
Athenian Socialism 55
The "Solonic Law" 57
In Peru, Mexico and Elsewhere 59

CHAPTER IV

LABOR'S ATTITUDE 64
Trade Unionism versus Socialism 64
British Politics and Trade Unionism . . . 65
The "Taff Vale Decision" 69
Labor Revolt, August, 1911 72
American Political-Labor Movement . . . 75
The Federation of Labor and Socialism . . . 78
Socialist Criticism of the Federation . . . 83

CHAPTER V

UTOPIANISM 86
Utopian Romances 86
Experimental Utopianism 90
Secular Societies 92
Sectarian Communism 97

CHAPTER VI

STATE AND MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM . . . 102
Bismarck and State Socialism 102
German Workmen's Insurance and Old Age Pensions 103
State Socialism Defined 104
State Socialism Through Taxing the Rich . . 106
British Old-Age Pension Scheme 107
Where the Money Comes From 109
American State Socialism 111
Municipal Socialism 114
A Costly Experiment 116

CHAPTER VII

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM 121
The Churches and Christian Socialism . . 121
The Movement in England 123
American Christian Socialism 127
Continental Christian Socialism 130

CHAPTER VIII

MARXIAN SOCIALISM 135
The Fundamentals 135
Marx's "Capital" 137
The Marxian Theory of Values 141
"Surplus Value" 145
Capitalism 147
Collectivism 149
The "Industrial Revolution" 150
How Will Collectivism be Established? . . 154
The Co-operative Commonwealth 159
Socialism as Affecting Religion and the Family 161
Socialism Involves Ethics as Well as Economics 166
Wages and Distribution of Products 170

CHAPTER IX

SOCIALISM IN AMERICA 176
Backwardism of American Socialism . . . 176
The "International" and American Socialists . 179
The "International" Transferred to New York . 182
The Socialist Labor Party 183
The Socialist Party 186
Anarchism in America 192
The Moyer-Haywood Murder Case 197
The McNamara Outrages 199
Present Outlook 200

CHAPTER X

BRITISH SOCIALISM 203
The Most Active Force in England 203
Characteristics 204
Socialism Essentially English in Origin . . 207
John Ball, the First English Socialist . . . 210
The "Industrial Revolution" in England . . 213
The "Luddites" 215
The "Chartists" 217
The "International" in England 223
The Social Democratic Federation 227
"Fabianism" 236
The Independent Labor Party 239
The Labor Party 244
Socialism Submerges Trade Unionism . . . 248
Has Socialism Been Halted? 252
The Anti-Socialist Movement 256

CHAPTER XI

CONTINENTAL SOCIALISM. 260
In Germany 260
Modification of German Socialism 268
French Socialism 275
The Movement in Austria 279
Italian Socialism 282
Russia's Revolutionary Socialism 284
Belgian Socialism 291
Socialism in Holland 294
In Switzerland 296
In Denmark 300
In Norway 302
In Sweden 303
Spain and Portugal 305

CHAPTER XII

THE NEW "INTERNATIONAL" 307
NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF SOCIALISM 310

CHAPTER XIII

CONCLUSION: A CRITICISM 314

INDEX 333

FOREWORD

While making some Consular investigations of the municipal ownership and operation of certain "public utilities" in Great Britain some years ago, the writer was attracted to the study of the entire range of Socialism. He can truly say that he approached and followed up the subject with an open and receptive mind. It is a boast of Socialists that no student can make an impartial examination of Collectivism without becoming an adherent at heart, even though he may never formally enroll himself as a "comrade." That has not been so in the case of the author. Profoundly impressed as he is with the idealism of the movement, and fully appreciative of the beneficence and sound policy of many of the State's activities in spheres formerly reserved for individual enterprise, yet he has become firmly convinced that so-called Scientific or Modern Socialism—in its ultimate aim—is both ethically wrong and economically unsound and impracticable. He is confident in his own mind that an actual Collectivist Commonwealth would be a tragic failure; and he is also confident that the establishment of such a State—even as an experiment —is an impossibility within any measurable distance of time—at any rate in America.

Of books on Socialism there are many; but almost without exception they are either too technical for the average reader or are distinctly one-sided. The aim of

the author has been to present a popular and impartial exposition of the different schools and phases of Socialism, according to the recognized authorities; and he has endeavored to fairly and adequately state all propositions and arguments even though he might radically dissent therefrom. He has not intentionally misquoted or misrepresented any individual or school of thought.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Two Remarkable Pronouncements.

Within recent years there have been remarkable pronouncements on Socialism by two famous men, who are representatives of the highest types of American and British citizenship—Ex-President Roosevelt and Ex-Premier Rosebery. Both vehemently denounced Modern Socialism. The pronouncement by Lord Rosebery was in a speech delivered at London, on March 12, 1908, he declaring that "Socialism is the end of all —Empire, religious faith, freedom, property; Socialism is the death-blow to all!" And since then he has repeated and amplified this declaration.

Socialism in England.

Lord Rosebery's view is certainly shared by the vast majority of British subjects, who have a traditional horror of French Revolutionary Communism, with which Socialism has been associated in the popular mind in the past. But time has wrought ominous changes; and within the last decade there has been an amazing

growth of Socialism in England. It is only within the last few years that the British public have come to a full realization of the extent of the development of Socialism—this development being at first by a silent, unobtrusive, permeative, and almost stealthy Fabian process, but latterly by an open and defiant militant campaign, already boastfully confident of complete success. Thoughtful students of the times now recognize that the coming, if not the imminent, issue in England is not that of Tariff Reform, Home Rule, Female Suffrage, the Abolishment of the House of Lords, the Disestablishment of the Church—but Socialism! Having become alarmed, the British public are taking steps to meet the issue. Heretofore, Socialism has had the field practically to itself in England; but now, for the first time in its history, it is confronted with intelligent and organized opposition. The gigantic struggle which has commenced in Britain will be watched with absorbing interest on this side of the Atlantic. The tendency of much of the recent British legislation in response to demands of Labor-Socialists, must inevitably have a pauperizing influence upon the working people. Such virtues as self-help, thrift, personal independence, and individual initiative—and even national patriotism—are now openly laughed to scorn by many British Socialists as out of date. Not only in the creation of sentiment among the working people has the spirit of Socialism made tremendous progress in England during the last ten years, but in actual legislation, both national and local. Nevertheless, that Socialism in its quintessence, that is, Collectivism (the public ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange), will be adopted by the British people, is unthinkable.

As the greatest of all American economic Radicals, Henry George, wrote to an English editor: "Socialism is so vague and contradictory that it cannot stand argument. Its very vagueness commends it to men who will not or cannot take the trouble to think, but in the long run the men who do think will win, if the discussion is only kept up."

It can reasonably be expected that the critical discussion and organized opposition against which British Socialism has now to contend, will finally win the day, although nothing can stop the progress of practical ameliorative legislation. But, in the meanwhile, organized Labor has "cast the die"; and before it realizes that it has made a colossal blunder in surrendering itself to Socialism—before it is compelled by hard inexorable facts to understand that the "ultimate aim" of Socialism is wildly extravagant, destructively inconoclastic, and absolutely impracticable—there will probably be bitter times in the old Mother Land. Indeed, there have already been bitter times—in the unexampled Labor-Socialist outbreaks of 1911.

Relation to Religion and Morality.

Ex-President Roosevelt's pronouncement against Socialism appeared as an editorial in *The Outlook* (New York), March 20, 1909, and was his parting message to his fellow-countrymen before he went on his African hunting expedition. Here is a sample sentence in Mr. Roosevelt's editorial:

> The doctrinaire Socialists, the extremists, the men who represent the doctrine in its most advanced form, are, and must necessarily be, not only convinced opponents of private property, but also bitterly hostile to all religion and morality;

> in short, they must be opposed to all those principles through which alone, even an imperfect civilization can be built up by slow advances through the ages.

When Ex-President Roosevelt wrote this fierce denunciation of Modern Socialism he was the voluntary spokesman of the vast majority of his fellow-countrymen. His condemnation is quite natural as coming from a sturdy Individualist, a vigorous thinker, a family man with old-fashioned ideas of morals, and a conservative in religious matters, whose conception of the Marxian theory is based on the writings and speeches of a certain group or school, which, it might be remarked, arrogates to itself the exclusive possession of "orthodoxy."

Still, there are many Socialists whose views most certainly cannot be stigmatized as immoral. They look upon the ultimate goal of Socialism, the Co-operative Commonwealth, as purely a political, an industrial and an economic condition of society, and deny that it would have any bearing upon religion or morals, except as improved environments naturally have a tendency to raise the social and ethical status of the human race; and, at any rate, they claim, morals and religion would be exclusively a private matter, under Socialism. This is the general professed public position of present-day organized Socialism in the United States, Great Britain, and Germany.

But it can well be protested that these professions and pleadings are out of harmony with doctrines laid down by nearly all of the brainiest and most logically consistent of the exponents of what is generally recognized as orthodox Socialism. The logical application of the theories of Marxism precludes the pre-determina-

tion, by conscious individual choice or concerted resolution, of the relation of the Co-operative Commonwealth toward morals or religion, or any of the ethical, social, or even political phases of public or private life. Orthodox Marxism asserts that the entire sociological and political structure can only take form as the logical outcome of a definite process of historical development, based upon the economic system prevailing at the time. Hence, the attitude of Socialism toward morality, the family, or religion, and the probable result of the application of Socialistic theories thereon, are to be judged not by the declarations or protests of individual Socialists, nor even of international or national Socialist congresses,—seeking votes—but by the general philosophy and tendency of the movement, and there is no mistaking that philosophy and tendency, either from observation and study or from the declarations of the founders and conceded leaders of the movement.

The doctrine of the materialistic propulsive force of Socialism,—almost Oriental fatalism—as expounded by all the acknowledged orthodox followers of Marx, is not neutralized by the later expositions of amiable "trimmers," who seek to reconcile Modern Socialism with firmly-grounded and tested economies and ethics.

It is a noteworthy fact that in the English elections of 1909 the partial reversals of the astounding Socialist triumphs of 1906 were largely the result of the *exposé* of the real position of Marxism in relation to religion and ethics. As early as 1894 Prof. Ely had foreseen what has been the greatest stumbling-block to the extensive and permanent development of Modern Socialism in English-speaking countries, for in the first edition (issued in the year named) of *Socialism and Social*

Reform, he says: "Socialism in England and America can be appreciated in its full strength only when it becomes entirely emancipated from the materialistic conception of history advanced by Karl Marx; for in neither country can Socialism meet with favor when it finds its basis in materialism." This is also the position of Kirkup, the English advocate of a "purified" Socialism; but it is also the position which is bitterly resented by the greatest advocates of Modern Socialism, living and dead.

Variations and Agreements.

The student is confronted with the fact that there are a variety of schools of Socialism; and he cannot fail to notice that some members of certain schools are as intolerant toward other schools as some "religionists" are with respect to members of other sects. It is the fashion of many Socialist writers to adopt toward opponents either a lofty air of intellectual superiority, amounting to contemptuous patronage, or else a tone of abuse. They are impatient with disputants, and seem almost amazedly indignant that anybody should be so ignorantly presumptuous as to dare to question their assertions and deductions. When no other argument is handy, there is always the claim that the non-Socialist does not understand Socialism. This is especially true of those who proudly give the prefix "Marxian" to their particular brand. American Socialists are among the worst offenders in this regard. Most of the American Socialist journals are distinguished for abusiveness, and but few of them are worthy of perusal as exponents of a world-wide movement. It is quite in the order of things for Socialists to say that Mr. Roosevelt does

not understand Socialism; but he certainly has a knowledge of one kind. A leading representative of another variety, Bernard Shaw, the English Fabian, asserts that some of the self-styled Marxians are not fully read up in and probably could not understand the writings of Karl Marx, the arch-priest of Modern Socialism. And Bernard Shaw is probably correct. Kautsky, the German editor, is still hard at it issuing further volumes of *Das Kapital,* but there are probably very few men, either in America or England, who have read the entire half-dozen volumes forming the complete stupendous work, the notes of which (excluding the first volume) were turned over to Engels for compilation after the death of Marx, Kautsky taking up the work after the death of the former.

Yet, there is one central point, one cardinal doctrine, as to which practically all Socialists, of all schools, are agreed, as an abstract proposition, and that is the collective ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange, which can be operated "socially," for the equitable good of all. At first sight it would appear that an agreement upon this point—even though the agreement be only of a general nature—is sufficient reply to the charge that there are different and conflicting kinds of Socialism; but upon investigation it will be found that there are a number of radical differences growing out of not only the interpretation of Collectivism, but also as to its application. The Collectivist Commonwealth is such a nebulosity that no two Socialists can agree even as to its outline, let alone its concrete substance.

As to the other aspects and phases of Socialism, there is hopeless disagreement. When Socialists say, as some

do, that there is only one kind of Socialism—and that is always the kind which they themselves preach—they unconsciously or deliberately shut their eyes to the facts. Next to the followers of Mr. Hyndman in England, the most professedly orthodox of them all are the Social Democracy of Germany, and they have considerably modified their attitude if not their doctrines within recent years. As to the British Socialists, the overwhelming majority of them are avowedly Fabian Opportunists, notwithstanding the declarations of the "Laborites" in favor of "class-conscious" Revolutionary Socialism, and their recent admission into the ranks of "Internationalism," the rallying cry of which is "class consciousness" and the downfall of Capitalism.

In America.

Coming to the United States, Socialism is "in the air." There is not, as yet, any American "school." The literary leaders of the movement in this country are, with few exceptions, adherents of rigid, cold, German Socialist Calvinism. This is primarily owing to the fact that the establishment of Socialism in America was mainly through German revolutionary immigrants. Outside of the Christian Socialists—who are little else than sentimentalists—the prevailing Socialism in this country is dominated by what the Anglo-American expounder, Spargo, designates as "the handful of German Socialist exiles in America, who sought to make the American workers swallow a mass of ill-digested Marxian theory." In this connection, Spargo quotes the greatest of all authorities next to Marx himself, Engels, who makes the following remarkable criticism of the German presentation of Socialism in America: "The Germans

have never understood how to apply themselves from their theory to the level which could set the American masses in motion; to a great extent they do not understand the theory itself, and treat it in a doctrinaire and dogmatic fashion. . . . It is a credo to them, not a guide of action." As to the unscientific, Opportunist, Fabian Socialism of England, Engels has this to say: "Here an instinctive Socialism is more and more taking possession of the masses, which, *fortunately,* is opposed to all distinct formulation according to the dogmas of one or the other so-called organizations." The German Socialists in America have not kept up with their comrades of the Fatherland in economic evolution. Theoretically, the leaders of Socialism in America are, as a rule, uncompromisingly revolutionary: not that they are in favor of a physical revolution to bring about the realization of their ideas, but that they believe—as Marx taught—that social and economic conditions will get worse and worse, until finally they will become unbearable; and then, by a catastrophic change, through the proletariat securing control of the machinery of government, the Co-operative Commonwealth will be established; that, in fact, the present economic and social state is past being mended, but must be ended: and its ending, and the substitution of Collectivism, constitute the "revolution" referred to. In justice to the "advanced," "scientific" Socialists so vigorously condemned by Mr. Roosevelt, it is proper to keep this in mind, as many critics evidently interpret the word "revolution," used in this connection, to mean a resort to physical force. There are physical-force Socialists, but they are in an infinitesimal minority in such countries as the United States, Great Britain and Germany. Broadly

speaking, the school in opposition to Revolutionary Socialism is that of the Fabians, who have shaped and directed the movement in England, and whose policy is, despite assertions to the contrary, considerably modifying Marxian Socialism throughout the world. This school—destined to be the predominant one—is also known as Opportunist and Constructive. American Socialism has already commenced to cast its hard Marxian shell, and is taking on the more adaptable garment of Fabianism, of a cut and color suited to American conditions.

Is Revolution Imminent?

Both in America and England there is a popular belief that Modern Socialism, irrespective of any particular school, is directly connected with, and is, indeed, the actual descendant of, French insurrectionary Communism. This is the view taken by one of the most slashing of the English critics, W. Lawler Wilson, in a remarkable book, *The Menace of Socialism*. Mr. Wilson considers it practically certain that—

1. A social revolution will break out in Europe within the next two or three years.
2. This revolution will be more extensive in area and terrible in character than any that has occurred for two generations past.
3. The revolutionaries will win great temporary successes and will succeed in establishing local governments.
4. The rebellion will be suppressed after much bloodshed, after which the Social Revolutionary movement as a whole will die out for the greater part of a generation.

It is noteworthy that some Socialist writers take the same view that Mr. Wilson does, except that they be-

lieve that the revolution will be permanently successful. But, at the same time, it is proper to repeat that most of the recognized representative authorities disclaim all idea of a physical revolution.

Labor and Socialism.

There are two different Socialist organizations appealing to the suffrages of the American people, and both of them are based upon the "class consciousness" of the working men. Here it is pertinent to remark that there is no country in the world where—at present, at any rate—there is less class consciousness than in the United States, whether among the working men or any other element of the general citizenship. As Socialism has been presented to the American people, it has never (until recently) appealed to any considerable number of them, especially among the native element—not even to a large number of what, for the sake of definiteness, may be classed as the "proletariat." Socialism must be "Americanized"—that is, it must be formulated and modified to meet American ideas and conditions—before it can become a potential force in the political and social life of this country. It must be confessed that there are now circumstances and conditions in process of development which will not unlikely bring this about, irrespective of the attitude of the present leaders of either Socialism or the Trade Union movement, which at present is not a mutually cordial one; and it is noteworthy that in this respect American organized Labor occupies an absolutely unique position, as this is the only progressive country in the world in which the two movements are not allied, to a greater or less extent. In England, Socialism was nothing but a shadowy, far-off

theory or cult, held by but a few, until an "alliance" with organized Labor was formed; and the cause which brought about this alliance was a judicial decision which Trade Unionists looked upon as an assault upon their organizations, by destroying them through bankrupting their treasuries, as they claimed. The judgment in question is what is known as the "Taff Vale decision," making Trade Unions financially responsible for damages in strikes and boycotts. Some such an incident may throw organized labor in this country into the arms of Socialism. It is a fact of grave significance that the special grievance of American organized Labor is one growing out of judicial decisions, it being claimed, indeed, that in this respect American Trade Unionists are at a great disadvantage as compared with their British comrades.

Developments in America.

The American people are only just beginning to appreciate the profound importance of the question of Socialism. But until the last two years, organized Socialism has been but little in evidence in this country except during Presidential elections. It not only lacks effective organization, but it is indefinite in expression and aim. Unquestionably, the peculiar form of the American system of government—Federal and State—has something to do with the difficulty of focussing the theory upon conditions here. A characteristic difficulty which Socialism—and also Trade Unionism—has to contend against in America, as compared, say, with England, is one arising from the written Federal and State constitutions in this country. This fact makes it impossible—in a practical sense—for a State legislature or

even for Congress to pass laws similar to many which have been passed by the British Parliament within the last few years. Reference is here made to laws granting special privileges and immunities to organized Labor, as is done in the new British Trades Disputes Act. But, apart from these considerations, the Co-operative Commonwealth has been too visionary, too theoretical, for the average, practical, "hurry-up" American to take much interest in it. Nevertheless, the general principles and mode of thought of the Socialists are now appealing to an ever-increasing number of Americans—and native Americans at that. The time was when Socialism, to the native American mind, was associated exclusively with recent arrivals from the Teutonic Fatherland, who discussed Karl Marx and the "coming revolution" over steins of lager beer; but that day has passed. In the old countries it is mainly hatred of class distinctions which has turned the hopes of the proletariat to Socialism as the only means of their redemption, socially, industrially and politically. These class distinctions originally sprang from the hereditary privileges of the few, especially as to the possession of the land; and it was no less an American than John Adams who said, "Those who own the land will rule the country." When the "industrial revolution" came about, these hereditary distinctions in Europe were supplemented by another difference almost as great,—that of the possession of the means of production by the few and the lack of ownership of these means by the many. It is a matter of common remark among Americans, when they are frank with themselves, that class distinctions are now developing in this country. While there is an absence of hereditary privileges, the distinction between the "haves" and

the "have-nots" is all the time growing; and while there is not the hopeless, squalid poverty and pauperism to be even approachably seen in America as compared with England, yet, on the other hand, great wealth in the hands of the comparatively few is more arrogantly ostentatious, and is also more vigorously denounced, in America, than in the older countries; and it is also a fact that in the attainment of great wealth the rights of the people are held in less respect in America than in most other countries—although a refreshing change in this regard is within sight. To put the matter in a nutshell: the multi-millionaire is more unpopular in America than is the hereditary aristocrat in Europe. Every candid student of the times must come to the conclusion that as the development of the ownership of the means of production in the hands of vast combinations proceeds, so likewise will there develop a growth of the class-conscious feeling among the working people of America; and it is the full recognition of this class consciousness which is the hope and mainstay of Socialism.

It may be accepted as a settled thing that the time is near at hand when the working people of America will demand actual representation in the halls of legislation —Municipal, State, and National;—in fact, that time is already here. Heretofore, the American working man has been content to be included in the general body of the electorate and citizenry. It may be said that he ought to be still so satisfied—that there ought not to be any political class distinctions; and, in an ideal state of society, this is undoubtedly true. But, under existing conditions, and in the absence of any great overwhelming public questions, men will vote as they think their own personal, selfish interests are involved. There is no

such great question dividing political parties these days, and the outlook is that the coming questions to be decided will be chiefly economic. It is therefore inevitable that the working people, dependent on wages for a living, will from now on begin to look at public questions from more of a class-conscious standpoint than they formerly did; and the first expression of this change of attitude will be in the struggle for special representation in legislative bodies. In this connection it should be borne in mind that about the only great special "interest" which is not represented at Washington is that of Labor.

Socialism Already Here!

The year 1910 will be historic in the history of American Socialism: For the first time a large city (Milwaukee) elected a Socialist Mayor and government, and the first Socialist Representative to Congress (Victor Berger, of the same city) was elected. And in 1911 Socialism won some notable triumphs in local elections.

Let not the American people deceive themselves. Let them take warning from the experience of the British people, who complacently (and characteristically) ignored the existence and growth of Socialism until the elections of 1906 startled them; and then they were amazed to discover what a giant Socialism was, and how it was entrenched in the very citadel of the British Empire—in the Mother of Parliaments.

Socialism—the real article, Modern, Scientific, Revolutionary Socialism—has obtained a foothold in America; it is bound to grow, and probably to grow enormously, within the not distant future. So far, organized Labor has been the rock against which Revolutionary

Socialism has beaten in vain in its efforts to become an effective political force in America. But that impediment shows signs of yielding—as it has yielded in England. Indeed, in 1910, and still more so in 1911, organized Labor and Socialism "pooled their issues" on many questions, and there is now an increasing tendency toward a practical alliance as to "immediate demands," if not an actual acceptance of the theory of Collectivism on the part of Trade Unionism. It is significant that avowed Socialists—sometimes of the extreme Revolutionary type—are often now found at the head of Labor organizations, and in their extravagances of expression it is often difficult to determine in which capacity they speak. Notwithstanding that the Socialists have a wordy war with the old-line Trade Unionists at each annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor, and notwithstanding that there is much personal bitterness between the Socialists and the President of the Federation (Samuel Gompers), yet there is an unmistakable drift toward "getting together" on the part of the rival elements, the opposition being largely one of tactics and individual jealousy.

The late Senator Hanna is often quoted as saying that the coming conflict in America will be between the forces of Socialism and anti-Socialism; and 1912 was named by him as the date of the beginning of the Titanic struggle.

Robert Owen, the Father of Modern Socialism.

The foundation idea of Modern Socialism was chiefly humanitarian:—the expression of the philanthropic love for his fellow-beings by Robert Owen, who was born at Newton, Montgomeryshire, North Wales, May 14, 1771.

His name is intimately related to America, not only on his own account, but on account of his distinguished son, Robert Dale Owen.

Robert Owen is often styled "the father of Modern Socialism." Karl Marx is generally so honored—and he undoubtedly is its greatest prophet; but the truth is that Marx only gave scientific expression and elaboration to principles laid down by Owen a year before Marx was born; and some of the distinctive doctrines of Marxian Socialism had been enunciated long before then, by English economists, principally. In a practical sense—and apart from Owen's Utopianism and his other wild schemes—Owen is entitled to the distinction of being the first of Modern Socialists; the birthplace of the movement was London, and the year was 1817. Owen appeared that year before a committee of the House of Commons, and made a report on the Poor Laws, which at that time were a disgrace to England. In that report Owen claimed that the permanent cause of distress was in the competition of human labor with machinery, and that the only effectual remedy was in the united action of working men and the subordination of machinery. Owen was not in favor of abandoning machinery, but he believed that the manufacturing system could be so arranged as to be an advantage to the whole community, instead of being, as he strenuously insisted, a curse. One of Owen's most active friends in "high places" (and he had many, including Queen Victoria's father) was Lord Shaftesbury, "the workingman's friend," who was, however, an anti-Socialist. Owen's original schemes for the cure of pauperism were favored by such conservative organs of public opinion as the London *Times* and the *Morning Post.* After

returning from America (where he had been in the interest of a communal association, the "Harmonists"), he devoted himself to carrying on a propaganda for Socialism and Secularism, with lax ideas of marriage. Just when Owen was at the apex of his popularity, and when some of his ideas seemed to be most promising in outlook, he declared, at a meeting in London, his hostility to all forms of received religion. From that time Socialism became identified with infidelity, and was suspected and discredited. Later in life Owen became a firm Spiritualist.

While Owen's fame as a Socialist is mainly in connection with his schemes of communal co-operative associations, both in America and England (now known as "Utopian Socialism"), yet, as a matter of fact, he was the first reformer to understand—although not in its entire conception—the philosophic and economic basis of Modern Scientific Socialism. Brougham Villiers says (*The Social Movement in England*) that up to the commencement of the Victorian era, Owen was probably "the most modern Socialist in the world."

It is a remarkable fact that the beginning of Modern Socialism did not arise from the agitation or action of organized Labor, nor of an individual proletarian, but sprang from the philanthropic action of a middle-class capitalist, a member of the much-disliked *bourgeoisie*—for that is what Robert Owen was. In September, 1833, Owen addressed a convention of the Builders' Union, at Manchester, England, and it was on this occasion that he declared that "labor is the source of all wealth" —thus anticipating Marx, or at any rate a doctrine held by most Marxists.

There can be no doubt that the ever-present weight

on his mind of the great cause to which he had devoted his life affected his judgment in his later years; and he became erratic and extravagant in his ideas. Eight years before he died he made the wild declaration that the world was "a great lunatic asylum!" Yet, there are but few men in the history of efforts to benefit the human race and to restrain "man's inhumanity to man," whose memory deserves greater honor than Robert Owen, the "father of Modern Socialism." The most convinced of anti-Socialists can join in that tribute.

CHAPTER II

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

Origin of the word "Socialism."

There has been much discussion as to the origin of the word "Socialism;" but there is now, however, a general agreement that it was first used in the *Poor Man's Guardian* (England) in 1833, and that it became for the first time current in England in 1835, during the Robert Owen agitation. Shortly afterwards, a French critic of the theory, Reybaud, introduced the word on the Continent. Subsequently, another French economist, Pierre Leroux, author of a work expounding a system called "Humanitarianism," claimed to have invented the term in contradistinction to "Individualism;" and Leroux defined Socialism as a "political organization in which the individual is sacrificed to society." It is not unlikely that the term originated about the same time in more than one place.

Definitions.

Experts in economic terminology indulge in hair-splitting differences in defining Socialism. Prof. Robert Flint, of the University of Edinburgh—probably the keenest of all scholarly British critics—takes the position that there is not any satisfactory definition of Socialism, for the reason that there are so many varieties

and so many different points of view from which it is looked at. It would be unreasonable, he says, to ask for any definition which would be satisfactory to both Socialists and their opponents. Prof. Flint's own definition is: "Any theory of social organization which sacrifices the legitimate liberties of individuals to the will or interests of the community." E. Belfort Bax, the literary leader of British Marxism, comes to much the same conclusion that Prof. Flint does, he declaring in an article in *The Open Review* (London) July, 1909, that "A world-historic movement like Socialism is too big a thing to be fitted into the four corners of a one-sentence formula."

When Pierre Joseph Proudhon, the father of "Philosophic Anarchism," was before a magistrate on examination after the French Revolution of 1848, he was asked "What is Socialism?" His answer was, "Every aspiration toward the amelioration of society." "In that case," remarked the magistrate, "we are all Socialists." "That is precisely what I think," responded Proudhon. This reminds one of the declaration once made by the English statesman, Sir William Harcourt: "We are all Socialists now!"

Not only popularly, but also among students and economists, the term "Socialism" is now meant to apply specifically to Modern, Scientific, Marxian Socialism, including its varying interpretations. There are several kinds not now included, particularly Utopian Socialism, such as is presented in the form of romances by Plato in his *Republic,* More in his *Utopia,* and Bellamy in *Looking Backward;* and in such actual utopian communistic experiments as those made by the Owenites, the Harmonites, the Shakers, the Oneida Community,

the Zoarites, etc.,—all of which must be considered as failures not only from the Socialist view, but from the standpoint of plain, practical, every-day life. Neither does the term, as now used by informed people, apply to Bismarck's scheme of paternal "State Socialism," which, as a system, is repudiated as such, by the organized Socialists of Germany, although they practically acquiesce in it as "a means to an end"—that end being Collectivism. And yet, State Socialism is not only accepted by English Socialists, but most of their activities are in the direction of forcing the Government of the day, or the Councils of Municipalities, to grant instalments of State or Municipal Socialism, as the case may be. In 1896 the English Fabian Society issued a statement for the information of their Continental comrades, in which it was explained that the Socialism they advocated was "State Socialism exclusively." This opens up a wide field of controversy among Socialists; but briefly, the explanation of this apparent difference is that in a democratic country like England the proletarian objections to State Socialism which exist in a bureaucratic country like Germany, are not considered to be applicable. As a matter of fact, moreover, the practical Opportunism of British Socialism (sometimes called "Constructive Socialism") is now becoming the dominant school throughout the world.

It is said that Karl Marx, the "father" of so-called "Scientific" Socialism, never gave a concrete definition of his theory, except the following (from his preface to the second edition of his great elaboration *Capital*) be considered as one: "With me the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought."

There has never been framed any better brief definition of Modern Socialism in its economic aspect than that by one of its first expounders as well as critics—Dr. A. Shäffle, the eminent Austrian economist, in *The Quintessence of Socialism*:—"The Alpha and Omega of Socialism is the transformation of private and competing capitals into a united collective capital."

Paul Lafargue, who was a son-in-law of Marx, and one of the founders of Marxian Socialism in France, defines the theory as "a fatal economic evolution which will establish collective ownership in the hands of organizations of workers, in place of the individual ownership of capital."

John Stuart Mill, in the *Fortnightly Review*, April, 1879, says:

> What is characteristic of Socialism is the joint ownership by all members of the community of the instruments and means of production, which carries with it the consequence that the division of all the produce among the body of the owners must be a public act performed according to rules laid down by the community.

The Rev. Dr. Bliss (who is editor of the *Encyclopedia of Social Reform*, and is himself a Christian Socialist), after quoting a number of definitions, sums them up thus:—"Socialism may be said to be the collective ownership of the means of production by the community democratically organized and their operation co-operatively for the equitable good of all."

The Socialist organizations of America, Germany, and Great Britain define their basic principles in terms which, while differing in expression, are practically to the same effect. It should be added that land and such

natural products as coal, ore, etc., are included among "means of production," by Socialists of all countries.

The definitions given above, it will be observed, refer only to the industrial or economic side of Socialism. The latter-day Constructive Socialists claim that their theory has only an economic side; but nearly all the great shining lights who profess orthodoxy insist that Socialism means far more than a mere change of capital from private to public ownership. They argue that it is a *condition,* not a *creed,* and that that condition will affect all the relations of life: social, family, religious, artistic, etc., as well as industrial and political. It is here that the moral argument for and against Socialism forces itself to the front; and it is this fact, involving as it does such tremendously different conceptions of the system, which makes it practically impossible to frame any formula or brief definition of Socialism which will be adequately comprehensive as well as discriminatingly exact. Probably there is a consensus of judgment that the greatest living Socialist is Ferd. August Bebel, one of the founders of the German Social Democratic Party, and the leader of that party in the Reichstag. He gives this definition in *Die Frau und der Sozialismus*:—"Socialism is Science applied with clear consciousness and full knowledge to every sphere of human activity."

There is another pronouncement of Bebel's which is one of the most-often quoted of any ever made by an acknowledged leader of International Socialism:—"We aim in the domain of Politics at Republicanism; in the domain of Economics at Socialism, in the domain of what is to-day called Religion at Atheism."

This phase of the subject is treated at some length in the chapter devoted to Marxian Socialism.

What is "Orthodox" Socialism?

There is a sharp controversy going on in current Socialist literature—which sometimes takes a personal turn—as to who are really true believers; and the charge is made by certain Socialists that some of the most prominent men identified with the movement are heterodox, and in some cases are really base pretenders. For some time there has been waging a polemic between the English Fabians and the strict Marxians. G. Bernard Shaw, the eminent playwright, and almost as eminent as a Socialist, has a preface to the last edition (1908) of *Fabian Essays,* in which he is very sarcastic in his references to the "many little societies locally known as 'the Socialists,' "—meaning the self-styled "scientific" followers of Karl Marx. With that playful humor which is his own he derides their worship of the "Master," "of whose works they are for the most part ignorant and of whose views they are intellectually incapable." According to Bernard Shaw, the particular school of which he is such a distinguished leader has swept the field during recent years. Says he: "Since 1889 the Socialist movement has been completely transformed throughout Europe; and the result of the transformation may fairly be described as Fabian Socialism." On the other hand, John Spargo—who speaks from the standpoint of both an English and an American Socialist—declares in the *International Socialist Review* (Chicago), of May, 1909, that "there are few American Socialists who will take their Socialism from the *Fabian*

Essays." And yet, probably next to Blatchford's *Merrie England* there is no exposition of Socialism which has had such a world-wide circulation and popular influence as the *Fabian Essays!* It will hardly be disputed that the most philosophical and learned of all living British Socialist writers is E. Belfort Bax, the literary partner of the artist-poet, William Morris, the latter of whom is claimed by competent authority to be "the greatest personality that has ever been connected with Socialism in England, or perhaps in the modern world." (Brougham Villiers, *The Socialist Movement in England.*) In an essay defining what Socialism is and what it is not, Bax scornfully calls the Fabians "practical prigs!" And in another essay (*Christianity and Socialism*) he declares that the Fabians are "persons calling themselves Socialists . . . who are either unclear on the whole question or who are at variance with the fundamental article of Socialist doctrine on other points." In still another essay (*Faddist Fanaticism*), after describing a number of different so-called Socialists, Bax wearily exclaims, "O Socialism, Socialism, what queer fish they would have us assimilate in thy name!" He adjures his Marxian Social Democratic comrades to "remember that Socialist principle is definite and not to be played fast and loose with by Socialists." A true Socialist, he insists, must, if the occasion calls for it, even be "the enemy of his country, and the friend of his country's enemies!" Yet even Bax does not wholly accept the doctrines of Marx. No foreign Socialist author is better known—and, indeed, respected—in America than Sidney Webb, who specially wrote *Socialism in England* at the request of the American Economic Association, the work being published by the

Johns Hopkins University. But Bax refuses to recognize Webb as a Socialist; and referring to that High Priest of Fabianism, Bax inquires, with disgust, "Now, are we . . . to be condemned to hug such a man as this to our bosom as a 'comrade' because, forsooth, he can in a certain sense repeat that he favors the 'socialization of the means, etc.?'" In an article in the *Fortnightly Review* (London) of August, 1908, Bax repeats, word for word, the definition given by himself and William Morris in their joint work *Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome,* and adds: "This definition clearly shuts out mere *Socialistic legislation,* such as may obtain to-day within the framework, economic and political, of present Capitalist society, from the right to be described as Socialism, as is often done by 'practical politicians.'" The contention of Bax, as a consistent Scientific Socialist, is that no legislation or administration can be called Socialist unless its "definite and conscious aim" is Socialism. In the same month that the rigid, inflexible Bax defined his kind of Socialism in the *Fortnightly Review,* another—and just as distinguished—Socialist was expounding his brand of the faith in the *Contemporary Review*—H. G. Wells, the author of *New Worlds for Old,* and *The Future in America,* and other well-known works. Wells "disavows" Christian Socialism, which he calls the "Socialism of Condescension," and he emphatically repudiates Marxism, which he styles "the Socialism of Revolt." Mr. Wells resigned from the Fabian Society (too much Bernard Shaw!), and he now declares that he is more opposed to the "fugitive Socialism" of the Fabians than he is to any other kind; and he accuses the Fabian "specialist" of seeking to bring about Socialism by

"tricks and misrepresentations, by benevolent scoundrelism, in fact." How these Socialists love one another!

The question as to what constitutes orthodoxy in Socialism has recently become an acute one in regard to the status of the British Labor-Socialist allied organizations, and especially as to the views held by Keir Hardy, M. P., the founder of the Independent Labor Party, the most active of all the British Socialist societies in the field of politics. This is not simply a British question, as it has been brought over to America; and it directly affects the relations of the American Federation of Labor and other Trade Union bodies in this country to organized Socialism, both native and international.

Not Anarchism, nor Communism.

In a popular sense, Socialism is often confused with Anarchism and Communism; but theoretically—and indeed, practically—there is a great difference. Anarchism means the abolition of government and the sovereignty of the individual, which is the antithesis of Socialism. According to Anarchism, only individuals have rights; and the argument is, that as no individual has the right to coerce or govern another without his consent, neither has the State that right, the State being only an aggregation of individuals. So, according to this Anarchistic theory, no form of government is justifiable unless there is absolutely universal consent. The right of a majority to govern or coerce a minority is denied, even though that minority consists only of one individual. It is a mistake to suppose that Anarchists want to turn private property over to the State. But

they believe in voluntary association and in communal property—that is, that those who contribute their labor to the production of necessities should receive their share of the products, and consume them as they please. There are two schools of Anarchists: (1) Individual or Philosophic Anarchists, who do not, as a matter of policy, believe in the use of force to attain their ends; (2) Anarchist-Communists, who believe in overthrowing government by force. It is to the latter school that the bomb-throwers belong. Most of the Modern Socialists—from Marx down to the present day—not only disclaim all association and sympathy with Anarchism, but insist that their doctrine is absolutely opposed to it, as Socialism implies the supremacy of organized society over the individual, while Anarchism means the very opposite. And, it should be stated as a matter of justice, that in most constitutional countries the leaders of the two forces have generally opposed each other in seeking to obtain control of the proletarian movement. It is equally true, however, that in autocratic countries like Russia, and in non-democratic countries like Italy and Spain, Socialism and Anarchism are practically synonymous terms—or have been until quite a recent period. As a matter of argument, also, it is a legitimate contention that the result of Socialism would probably be—from a complete breakdown in itself, in practical working—either Anarchism or Absolutism.

In a theoretical sense there is also a difference between Socialism and Communism. Most Socialists now deny that they are Communists, although it is a curious fact that the first authentic international statement of Modern Socialism—the famous "call-to-arms" to the proletarians of the world, issued jointly by Marx and

Engels in 1848—was called "The *Communist Manifesto.*" And as late as 1888, Engels, in referring with pride to this title, declared that "we have, ever since, been far from repudiating it." An interesting question not unnaturally suggests itself from this confession:—Were not Marx and Engels really *Communists,* rather than Socialists, according to the present prevailing meaning of the term? And furthermore:—Are not most of their followers Communists at heart, notwithstanding their insistence upon a difference of definition? Intellectual Socialists indignantly deny the justice of classing them with the Communists or "Communards" of Paris, whose revolution, by the way, they claim, was owing to purely political and not economic causes. Yet, impartial students cannot be blamed for taking note of the fact that even at the present time Socialists, both individually and collectively, applaud the Communists of Paris, as they also do the Anarchists of Chicago. Nevertheless, there is a definite difference between the philosophy of Communism and that of Socialism, although they both contemplate the abolition of the present competitive, wage-earning system, and the substitution therefor of associated production and distribution. But there is this difference:

Communism, in the strict sense, means that *all* goods and property should belong to the community *in common,* this joint possession to include "consumption" goods (such as food, clothing, articles of personal use, etc.), as well as "production" goods (such as manufacturing plants, railways, mines, ships, raw materials, etc.); while Socialism—as now generally defined—contemplates the collective ownership of all means of "production and distribution" only, leaving to the individual

such "consumption" goods as he might earn or which might be allocated to him.

Division of Labor's Products.

Some authorities make this further difference:—Under Communism there is an equal division of products, or an allowance according to "needs;" while compensation or distribution of products under Socialism is according to "deeds"—that is, every man will receive the product-value of his own labor.

But there is a pronounced disagreement among even accepted Socialist authorities in regard to the last-mentioned point. There are, indeed, many different plans proposed, some utterly inconsistent with others, in regard to the compensation of labor: both as to the basis of compensation and how it should be administered, and also as to how the necessaries of life, as well as luxuries, should be supplied to individual members of the community. Some of the greatest thinkers among the Socialists—probably a majority—concede that to conserve the principle of equality (which is, in theory, the very soul of Socialism), and to prevent the re-establishment of "classes," it will ultimately be absolutely necessary to issue supplies "according to *need,*" if not on an equality. Only a few specimen authorities need be quoted:

Robert Blatchford gives this description in *Merrie England:*

> Under Ideal Socialism there would be no money at all, and no wages . . . . Every citizen would take what he or she desired from the common stock. Food, clothing, fuel, transit, amusements, and all other things, would be absolutely free.

Spargo, in *Socialism*, after laying it down that "equality of remuneration is not an essential condition of the Socialist regime," goes on to say: "It may be freely admitted, however, that the ideal to be aimed at ultimately must be approximate equality of income. Otherwise, class formations must take place and the old problems incidental to economic inequality reappear."

In their famous "Gotha Program" of 1875, the Socialist Workingmen's Party of Germany (the present Social Democracy) declared: "As the obligation to labor is universal, all have an equal right to such product [of work], each one according to his reasonable needs."

The brilliant Mrs. Annie Besant is now chiefly known by reason of her position as the leading Theosophist in the world; but the time was when she was almost as well-known as a Socialist—and so far as known she is still a Socialist. In her contribution to the *Fabian Essays* she strongly insisted that inequality of division would be "odious," and that the "Communal Council" would be driven "into the right path—*equal remuneration* of all workers."

The very highest authority, Marx himself, undoubtedly held that supplies would be furnished "according to need," when the system of Collectivism became ideal. He has enunciated two methods of distribution of the products of co-operative labor, according to the period or phase of Socialism. In the *Neue Zeit* (9th year, 1. pp. 566, 567), Marx laid this down as the program in the *first period* of Communist society:

> In accordance with this principle each producer [i. e., laborer, in contradistinction to capitalists who do not produce] will receive—after deduction has been made for the needs of the society—exactly what he has contributed to it.

His contribution is his individual share of labor. The social working day consists of the total of the individual hours of labor; the individual labor time of each producer is the part of the social working day furnished by him; it constitutes his share. The society will give him a certificate that he has furnished a certain quantity of work—after deducting his work for the common fund—and by showing his certificate he will draw from the society's stores an amount of provisions equivalent in value to his work. The amount of work given to the society in one shape is received again in another.

[It will be observed that Marx speaks of the Socialist Commonwealth or State as "the society."]

In *Capital* (vol. 1, p. 567, 4th German ed.) Marx explains that during this first period there will not be perfect equality, "but different individual talents and capacities will be acknowledged as privileges of nature. . . . In substance as well as in their nature rights will be unequal, . . . but these inconveniences are unavoidable during this first period of communist society which, after long travailing, is just then issuing forth from the womb of capitalist society."

But, in the *second period* of Communism, the right of each laborer to receive supplies "according to need" will be recognized. For, says Marx (*Capital*, vol. 1, p. 567):

In a higher phase of communist society, after the slavish subordination of the individual under the divisions of labor, and consequently the opposition between mental and bodily work has disappeared; after labor has ceased to be merely the means of sustaining life, but has become an urgent desire; after the individual has become more perfect in every respect, increasing thereby also the productive forces and giving full play to the fountains of co-operative wealth—then only the narrow ordinary barriers of right and justice can be

> demolished, and society may inscribe upon its banner: Each one according to his abilities, *to each one according to his needs.*

Keir Hardy, M. P., the apostle of the very latest eclectic conglomeration of differing Socialist schools, frankly confesses in his work, *From Serfdom to Socialism,* that Communism is "the final goal of Socialism."

There can be no doubt on the part of those familiar with current thought and political activity in the movement, that the Scotch Socialist, J. Haldane Smith, is perfectly correct when he declares in his protesting *Socialism or Communism?* that "a conscious movement towards Communism is apparent" in the ranks of British Socialism. And this is true of the world-wide movement, notwithstanding that Socialists protest that they are not Communists.

CHAPTER III

IN ANCIENT DAYS

Aboriginal Communism.

Socialism is as old as history, in the sense that ever since recorded time there have been aspirations and struggles to attain the Ideal State. Prof. LeRossignol (University of Denver) observes in *Orthodox Socialism* that "the inequality of man is the most striking fact in human history." The communal holding of property can be traced back to the beginning of history; but, so, also, can the existence of private property. The claim of Socialists that the establishment of Collectivism would only be a reversion to original conditions is supported by some eminent authors, but is questioned and indeed denied by others. Principally from the inborn desire for other men's possessions, tribes went to war, captives were made slaves, and were looked upon as chattels; and one of the Marxian assumptions is that the origin of capital was the profit derived from slave labor. During the evolution of primitive society, there was common possession of such things as boats and tents and articles of food, as well as of flocks and herds. When savagery gave place to barbarism, and when the roaming, hunting tribe developed into a pastoral and later on into an agricultural community, there was common possession—or, rather, common occupa-

tion and use—of land. In time, the tribes confederated into nations; and there was an accompanying change involving one of the most important facts in the whole sociological history of man. During the era of savagery and in the early period of barbarism, sexual matters had concerned the tribe rather than the individual members. But, gradually, with the organization of society, the relationship between man and woman became individually exclusive and mutual. This change marks the beginning of a modification in the principle of the common ownership of goods; and it also marks the foundation of family life.

The Family and Private Property.

It is not within the province of this work to discuss the conflicting theories as to the origin of the family as an institution; but there can be no denial of the statement that family life is intimately related to the conception of private property, although there is great difference among scholars as to whether the idea of marriage and the family had most to do with the conception of private property, or *vice versa.* But it is evident that this idea and conception acted and re-acted upon each other:—that is, that as marriage became recognized as the normal relationship between man and woman, and as the family life developed, so there grew up a desire on the part of man for private property, for exclusive use and enjoyment; and, on the other hand, as a man's private property accumulated, so likewise there manifested itself a desire for a wife and for children to share his possessions. Some coldly logical Socialists accept it as inevitable that pure and consistent Collectivism must result in a dissolution of the present marriage

relation and a break-up of the existing family institution; and there are those who, with brutal frankness, confess that the greatest obstacles to the establishment of their system are the marriage and family ties as now established—and that until they are abolished it is impossible for genuine, thorough Socialism to be established.

Such eminent authorities as Emile de Laveleye, Professor of Political Economy at Liége (born 1822, died 1892), and Sir Henry Maine, an English jurist and economist (born 1822, died 1888), maintained that the separate ownership of land and chattels is of modern growth, and that originally ownership was in communities of kinsmen. The theories of Maine as to the communal "villages" of India are to this day confidently pointed to as demonstrating the practicability of Socialism so far as the land is concerned. But B. H. Baden-Powell, M. A. (Oxford), is a later authority than Sir Henry Maine, and he shows that the latter confounded communal ownership with a system of cultivation for the common support of local groups. Fustel de Coulanges, of Paris (born 1830, died 1889), left an uncompleted work which is considered a masterly refutation of Laveleye's communistic theories. He argued that ancient property in land was on the seigneurial rather than the communal tenure. "National communism," he says, "has been confused with the common ownership of the family; tenure in common has been confused with ownership in common; agrarian communism with village commons."

Holy Writ itself testifies not only as to the establishment or recognition of private property in land, but also as to its inheritance. Jehovah instructed Moses to

divide the newly-possessed Land of Canaan for an inheritance among his families, according to their size. The portion assigned to each man became his inalienable property, and descended in perpetuity to his heirs; and by the Law of Jubilee the land was restored, free of encumbrance, to the heirs of its original holder, every half-century.

It has been contended that the old Roman constitution provided for equality of property in land. But Prof. George Ferguson, in his article on "Agrarian Laws" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica,* declares that this belief, so long held, is altogether erroneous, and he confirms the conclusion of Prof. Niebuhr, the great Danish scholar, "that the agrarian laws of the Romans were in no case intended to interfere with or affect private property in land, but related exclusively to the public domain."

Authorities could be multiplied as showing the antiquity of the principle of private ownership, not only in land, but in every class of goods—immovable as well as portable, and that the claim of Socialists that private property is only a modern institution is absolutely untenable.

In 1904 the University of Chicago Press published a wonderfully interesting book, *The Code of Hammurabi,* King of Babylon, of date about 2250 B. C. The book gives facsimiles of the tablets bearing the Code, in autographed text, and in translations by Prof. Robert Francis Harper. The Code is a compilation of decrees of Hammurabi, providing for punishment not only for offenses against the person, but for stealing private property, and for trespassing on private land, and for injuries to private fields, gardens, and houses, etc. One

law reads: "A woman, merchant, property-holder, may sell field, garden, or house. The purchaser shall conduct the business of the field, garden, or house which he has purchased." There are laws as to the renting of fields for cultivation; also as to sub-renting; and there are regulations as to loans in which the anticipated crops are pledged as security. Punishment is provided for in cases of shepherds pasturing flocks on fields without the consent of the owners; but a public "common" is also mentioned by name. There are also laws governing the charge of interest on loans of money; family inheritances are provided for; and wages are named for certain classes of work.

The presentation of this phase of the subject can be closed with two quotations, one from a Socialist authority and the other from an anti-Socialist. The first, the *Encyclopedia of Social Reform,* says, after giving the views of opposing writers: "Some argue that the correct balance of truth is that property was not originally held either by individuals or communally, but by bodies of men under some 'strong man'—despot, tyrant, or at best patriarch. This would be far from communism, but perhaps equally far from individual ownership." The second authority is John Gibbons, LL.D. (Chicago), in *Tenure and Toil:* "The writers of ancient poetry and ancient history serve alike to confirm the assertion that among the Greeks, Romans, Phœnicians, Carthaginians, and Egyptians the right of private ownership in property existed from the earliest period of which we have any definite data. In other words, wherever we find a commercial people, we find the right of individual ownership in property recognized."

Examples of Ancient Socialism.

One of the standard and strongest arguments against Socialism as now understood is that it is purely theoretical—that the system has never been tried. The most intellectual and authoritative advocates frankly concede that this objection is well taken, if the modern conception of Socialism be accepted; but they claim that there are examples of the Collectivist idea or of communal possession of property, dating from the most ancient times.

Socialist literature is full of references to Lycurgus, "the lawgiver of Sparta," and to his alleged division of land. The tradition is that Lycurgus brought over from Crete the institutions of the Dorians, and redivided property when he established a new civil constitution. It is said that he parceled out Laconia into 39,000 equal lots, 9,000 lots being assigned to Spartan citizens. In a very remarkable work by C. Osborne Ward (a government official at Washington, D. C.), *The Ancient Lowly,* it is claimed that under a system established by Lycurgus, the Spartans practiced communal ownership from 825 to 371 B. C. Mr. Ward says that there was not only common property, common education, and common eating—but that commerce was interdicted, and that stealing was authorized!

But scholarly Socialists do not lay much stress upon the story of Lycurgus and his division of land. They recognize that it is but a tradition at the best, and even if true bears but little relation to the modern idea of Socialism, and cannot, therefore, be cited as a demonstration of its practicability.

Athenian Socialism.

Of the instances of ancient Socialism, so-called, of more or less authenticity, none is pointed to so confidently and with so much pride, as the case of classic Athens. But it should be kept in mind that the Socialism of Athens was only for the free citizens:—that it did not benefit the slaves, although historians agree that the Athenians treated their slaves better than the Romans did. There are a number of estimates of the number of slaves in proportion to the free citizens in Athens; it is generally put down as three slaves to one free man. It is claimed that Socialism was virtually tried in Athens, under Pericles, the greatest of all Grecian statesmen, who flourished in the fifth century before Christ. Dr. Bliss quotes authorities in his encyclopedia declaring that this was the period of Greece's greatest glory, and that it produced men of unequalled ability—and this the editor of the *Encyclopedia of Social Reform* attributes to Socialism. In view of the current discussion in regard to the Communism of Modern Socialism, and especially as to rewards of labor under the Collective Commonwealth, it is interesting a note that Dr. Bliss, in an article in *The Outlook* (New York), says that the Socialism of classic Athens practically asked from each citizen labor according to his ability, and of the product gave to each according to his need; and this is the pure Marxian conception of ideal Socialism. Two institutions in the main accomplished this: one was called the "liturgies," and took from the rich for the benefit of the poor; and the other was called the "dicasticon," which was payment in money, daily, for public service (assumedly), given to any citizen who wanted it, practically, and in an amount

sufficient to enable him to live upon it in respectability and comfort. It was the latter institution, Dr. Bliss says, which, more than anything else, made Athens a Socialist State. There were a great many law courts in Athens, and citizens were paid daily amounts for performing jury service; and they also received pay for attending the popular assemblies, and for witnessing the elaborate religious ceremonies and rites, which were conducted and maintained by the State. The temples, baths, gymnasia, theatres, markets, etc., were built and managed by the State. The arts were cared for by the State, and the wonderful and incomparable Parthenon and Acropolis were the creation of State artists. Gold and silver mines, and the slaves who worked them, were owned by the State; and thus were supplied the official revenues, instead of by taxation. Commerce and trade were usually left to slaves, while the free-born citizens (Socialists!) "reaped the usufruct," and devoted themselves to "higher things." Notwithstanding the brilliant civilization of Athens, she fell—and deservedly so. Dr. Bliss admits that Socialist (!) Athens was immoral and corrupt, and that its family life was impure. The condition of Athens under so-called Socialism was even worse than Dr. Bliss admits. J. G. Frazier, in an article in the *Encyclopedia Britannica,* writes:

> According to Plato, it was a common saying that Pericles, by the system of payments which he introduced, had corrupted the Athenians, rendering them idle, cowardly, talkative, and avaricious. It was Pericles who introduced the payment of jurymen, and as there were 6,000 of them told off annually for duty, of whom a great part sat daily, the disbursement from the treasury was great, while the poor and idle were encouraged to live at the public expense. . . . It was part of the policy of Pericles at once to educate and

delight the people by numerous and splendid festivals, processions, and shows. But the good was mixed with seeds of evil, which took root and spread, till, in the days of Demosthenes, the money which should have been spent in fighting the enemies of Athens was squandered in spectacles and pageants. The spectacular fund or *Theorikon* has been called the cancer of Athens.

The "Solonic Law."

American Socialists quote extensively from the work by C. Osborne Ward, *The Ancient Lowly,* which sets forth the most remarkable alleged discoveries by the author as to the antiquity of Trade Unions and Socialism. Mr. Ward is an avowed Socialist, and his statements have all the animus of an extreme partisan. The evidence which he presents he says he unearthed from old manuscripts, tablets, chiselled records, and relics, in ancient cities and ruins in Italy and Greece, which he affirms were heretofore unknown or had been systematically smothered or ignored by other writers. Much space is given by Mr. Ward to what is called the "Solonic Law." Solon was a very wise man of Greece, and lived about 600 years before Christ. He had the confidence of his fellow-citizens, and they made him "Archon," or Chief Magistrate. The money lenders were eating up the substance of the land, and the small farms were plentifully sprinkled with "mortgage pillars;" and Solon's first act as "Archon" was to annul all mortgages, by having the pillars thrown down. This proceeding was deemed justifiable because the terms of the money lenders were unfair and oppressive; but there was no redistribution or confiscation of the land. Solon's next great reform was the reconstruction of the political system on the principle that every citizen was

entitled to share in the government of the country. Solon is said to be the father of universal suffrage—that is, as regards free citizens. But he realized that the people were not ready for "pure" democracy; he made property the measure of political power, and he confined the higher offices of State to the wealthy citizens. From them he made a Council of Four Hundred; —and the origin of the term "Four Hundred" as applied to the wealthy, exclusive "set" of New York, is no doubt from this Solonic law. But Mr. Ward goes far beyond what the above would indicate as to the character of Solon and his historic decrees. He pictures Solon—almost to the exclusion of anything else—as being the organizer of the proletarians, not only of Greece, but of the world as it was then known, first as Trade Unionists, and then as members of organizations forming parts of an universal scheme of Socialism! Mr. Ward claims that the Solonic Law provided for a common table, and that the Trade Unions held property in common and followed a communal code. The system under Solon appears to have been very much "mixed," according to Mr. Ward. The free citizens owned private property, but the members of the Trade Unions were not citizens, and a large proportion of them were slaves. Their right of combination was given to them by Solon. While their plan of organization was economic rather than political, when originally organized, yet at the time of Christ it was political, and they endorsed Christianity. Says this most astounding author: "There are reasonable grounds for believing that the original founders of Christianity, including the Master Himself, were initiates into the secret penetralia of this vast order!" These Trade Unions, accord-

ing to Mr. Ward, represented "pure, scientific Socialism"—and had the movement continued uninterruptedly, the millenium would long before this have arrived! It is asserted that the Syrians tried to break up this wonderful Socialist system, but were not able to do so, and the work of destruction was then undertaken by the Romans! And finally Solonic Socialism was killed by Diocletian, the Roman Emperor, in the third century after Christ. Some Socialists seriously quote this jumble of tradition and imagination as historic proof of the practicability of Socialism!

In Peru, Mexico and Elsewhere.

There was an enforced system of Communism among the original inhabitants of Peru, the Aztecs, in the days when they were lorded over by the Incas. The system of government was a pure despotic theocracy. The great mass of the Aztecs were serfs, and they were compelled to labor. In the hamlets and villages a man mounted a tower every evening and announced where and how the Aztecs serfs were to work the next day. Labor was in common, individual property among the Aztecs was abolished, and every detail in daily life was prescribed, according to fixed rules, the people being mere machines, governed by an immense staff of civil and religious officers. It is not to be wondered at that the Peruvians fell an easy prey to their Spanish invaders. And yet some Socialists say that the Peruvian experiment justifies the claim that Socialism is feasible!

In Mexico, centuries ago, there was a communism in land among the aborigines, the majority of whom were serfs, and were transferred with the soil which they

worked. The peasants and the slaves of the nobles were allowed a certain portion of land, which they cultivated in common, for their subsistence; and the surplus of what they produced they had to turn over to their masters.

Alfred Stead, in *Great Japan,* says that there are now in existence several Socialist communities within the Empire of the East, and that in one of these divisions the "single tax" has been in existence for centuries. This community levies all taxes on land, but at certain periods—of eleven, thirteen, or seventeen years—the land is impartially apportioned among the people. Mr. Stead gives a detailed account of the system of Socialism which is said to have been in force for centuries—and is still in force—in the Prefecture of Okinawa, which is comprised of thirty-six islands, their combined size being 170 square miles, and their population being 170,000. In addition to the private allotments of land, made as above stated, the community own a large tract of common land, on which they plant banana trees; and the trees are carefully preserved so that the fruit can be used by all the people in case of a famine. There is not a landlord on the whole of the islands. Mr. Stead is of the opinion that in all probability Socialism of a modified form will soon be introduced by the national government of Japan; but he thinks that in that country it is likely to develop along lines vastly different from those followed elsewhere.

In many parts of the world there have been "common" lands, existing from the earliest dawn of civilization. Under the ancient laws of Ireland, tribes had common possession of "live" and "dead" chattels, as well as land; and Prof. Leslie, of Belfast, in his great work,

Primitive Property, says that these ancient laws indicate that women were not only held as chattels but were held as such in common by clans and "septs" (joint families), and by smaller groups of kinsmen. There are ancient legal records of the original co-ownership and common cultivation of the soil of Denmark and Holstein by village communities. In England, groups of husbandmen cultivated the ground and fed their flocks and herds on a co-operative system which bears all the marks of descent from the primitive communal usages of the Teutonic race.

Alone among the countries of the world, Switzerland has maintained free political institutions and a system of communal possession of land contemporaneously, this system antedating feudalism:—the "Allmend," which is not extensive, and has hereditary features. "Allmend" means "the domain common to all." But the system is disintegrating under the influence of modern civilization; the communal land is now leased by public auction, and—contrary to ancient principles—strangers as well as citizens can now lease the land. There is a similar system in some of the mountainous districts of France.

The Russian institution of the "Mir" is frequently referred to as an example of the advantages of Collectivism, but the claim will not bear investigation. All land in Russia which is not owned by the Crown or the nobility is the common property of the community; and the aggregate of the inhabitants of a village possessing the land in common is known as a "Mir," which is ancient Russian for "commune." In theory, every male villager of legal age has an equal share in the "Mir." Formerly there was common cultivation in the

"Mir," but that custom has long been abandoned, and now the common land is divided into small plots and is distributed among the villages by lot or otherwise. But the institution is very unsatisfactory, especially under modern conditions; and the "Mir" and the extensive system of "Municipal Socialism" in Russia have paralyzed individual initiative and enterprise. The villagers do not feel that they have any permanent interest in any one piece of land, and they therefore only cultivate it in "hand-to-mouth" style; they do not manure it properly, neither do they provide for rotation of crops; and they only make such improvements as immediate necessities compel. Not only has the system resulted in the impoverishment of the land, but of the tenants as well, they being almost universally and hopelessly in debt.

In ancient Germany the village "Marke" possessed features analogous to the Russian "Mir." With the exception of the houses and orchards, everything was held in common, the land being divided into plots, and after being cultivated for a year, was allowed to "lie fallow" for a number of years.

When the Dutch went to Java they found a system of collective ownership and cultivation practiced by the natives. The Dutch have continued the system with modifications, which include the relations of the laborers to the State; in the old days the labor was forced, and even at the present time its status is very low.

The apostle of Modern Socialism cannot find any satisfactory precedent for Collectivism in the ancient examples: they were all utterly incompatible with the spirit

of modern times; in some instances they were based on slavery; and in the most conspicuous case, so-called Socialism was the direct cause of national ruin. Socialism has yet to justify its extravagant claims by a single successful experiment.

CHAPTER IV

LABOR'S ATTITUDE

Trade Unionism versus Socialism.

Although there can be no doubt that the majority of Socialists are Trade Unionists—except in such countries as Russia, where organized Labor is almost unknown—it is a notable fact that the two movements represented are often antagonistic. The relation between Socialism and Trade Unionism differs in different countries. In non-democratic countries, such as Italy and Spain, there is practically no difference, while in the most democratic country, the United States, there is the most pronounced difference which exists in any country. In Germany, Trade Unionists are divided into Roman Catholic, Protestant, and purely secular organizations—the most numerous being the latter. The secular bodies are practically all Socialist, while those organized on a distinctively Christian basis are anti-Socialist. As a rule, Trade Unionism and Socialism practically mean the same thing on the Continent (except in cases in which the former is organized on a religious basis): there may be two separate bodies, but they run in parallel grooves, one body working specifically on trade lines, while the other devotes itself to the political side of the proletarian movement; and on occasions both currents of agitation and action will coalesce for one mutual purpose.

In England and America there has been in the past a clearly-marked cleavage between Socialism and Trade Unionism; but within recent years there has been a closing-up of the gap in England; and there are developments in the same direction in the United States.

British Politics and Trade Unionism.

There are four well-marked periods of development in the history of the British Trade Union movement: (1) that of the origin of trade societies, gradually becoming permanent, and composed exclusively of journeymen who were wage earners; (2) a revolutionary period, when the Unions were fighting against the barbarous legislation of Parliament, and were struggling to secure the legal right to combine and to make "collective bargains;" (3) an era of conservative construction, and of growth into strong beneficial societies, a policy of non-participation in politics being generally observed; (4) that of the present time—of the "new" Unionism, the Labor organizations abandoning to a great extent their past policy of political neutrality, and affiliating with societies and movements outside their own special sphere, this alliance being for the accomplishment of specific political and economic ends—even including the "ultimate aim" of Modern Socialism, the communal ownership and control of the means of production and distribution. And it is significant that while British Labor-Socialists are keenly "Opportunist," they are generally to be numbered amongst the most extravagant of the Socialist brotherhood as to their declared economic objects—to be attained, however, by peaceful methods. But there are, it should be noted, already symptoms of a revolt or reaction against

the "new" Trade Unionism. During the year 1910 there was a revolt on the part of Conservative and other anti-Socialist trade unionists against being compelled to pay assessments for the election expenses and salaries of Labor-Socialist members of Parliament, and one of them named Osborne secured from the courts a decision which has become famous under his name, laying down the principle that as trade union funds are partly beneficial in their character they cannot be used for political purposes, and that a member cannot be expelled from his union for refusing to pay the special assessment.

Up to a certain point, the history of the Trade Union movement in the United States shows the same phases of development, except that they are not so definitely marked as in Great Britain, principally for the reason that there has not been such a pronounced difference between the employers and the working people of the new as in the older country.

The modern Trade Union, as the term is understood in America and England, is an organization of wage earners exclusively; and herein it differs in principle from the ancient trade guild, which was composed of craftsmen who owned the means of production, and oftentimes the raw material; and yet Trade Unions existed anterior to the establishment of the factory system. It is a popular supposition that the modern Trade Union is the descendant of the old trade guild; but the best authorities say that this is an error. In England, as in America, Unions have been primarily and until recently almost exclusively devoted to trade matters, the motto of the workingmen of the two countries being "No politics in the Union!" Still, organized

Labor in both countries has always strenuously fought for legislation directly in its own interest; and in the last Presidential campaign (1908) the American Federation of Labor, which by its constitution is inhibited from taking political action, openly—in an official sense—supported the Democratic candidate, on the principle of "helping our friends and fighting our enemies."

During the year 1909 the British Government attempted to sweep away "sweated" labor, not only by prescribing the conditions under which certain kinds of industry must be performed, but by establishing a "minimum wage." This has been denounced as "rank Socialism;" and so it is, in a manner; but it is only a reversion to the ancient British policy of State interference with the relations between employer and employed, the difference being, however, that while formerly the object of the law was chiefly to keep Labor down to the lowest possible condition, the object now is to raise the wages and the general environment. The famous—or rather, infamous—"Statute of Laborers," passed in the reign of Edward the Third (1327-1377), enacted that no person was to pay more than the old wages, although the price of provisions had increased very much; and employers who paid more than the prescribed rate were to be fined treble the amount paid or promised, while artificers and laborers were to be put in jail if they accepted more than the schedule wages. Magna Charta affected freemen alone, and at the time of King John it is probable that nearly one-half of the entire population of England were in a state of slavery; and on the Continent, not only was the proportion of slaves greater than in England, but their condition was much worse. Hume, the historian, describes the con-

dition of the working classes of Europe in ancient days as the most important difference between the social life then and in modern times. During the period of serfdom there was no "working class," as the term is understood now—that is, there were no free laborers who did not own the means of production and who worked for a stated wage. Consumers and owners provided the raw material, and they hired craftsmen direct; artisans were also kept regularly among the servants of the wealthy; the villeins (serfs) tilled the soil, and workmen in towns lived in the shop of their employer —a system still surviving in London with shop assistants, but fast disappearing, the custom now being known as "living in." The capitalist-employer, the first middleman, was not known until the seventh century; and the capitalist-purchaser of raw materials came later. Capitalist-artisans developed in the sixteenth century—that is, they became the purchasers of the raw materials upon which they exercised their handicraft skill; and in course of time they grew prosperous, accumulated capital, and ceased working at their trades themselves, and became "bosses," employing their former comrades in the industry who had not been as fortunate as they had been.

"Classes" began to arise in trade; and the non-working capitalist made his appearance. From the end of the fourteenth century down to the repeal of the anti-combination laws the whole spirit of British legislation was that of opposition to the working classes; and Prof. Rogers says (*Six Centuries of Labor and Wages*) that for fifteen or sixteen generations there was no appreciable improvement in the condition of the people. In 1562 the Statute of Laborers was amended,

and a new rate of wages was laid down, it being admitted in the new Act itself that the old rate was too low in several particulars. This extraordinary Statute prohibited Labor combinations throughout its entire continuance. It was not actually repealed until 1875, and then the last vestige of feudalism—that is, as it affected human liberty—was swept from the British statute books, although long before that time practically all trace of the old servitude system had disappeared.

Slowly the Trade Unionists entered the political arena:—first to obtain legislation directly affecting them as wage earners in their particular trade; and then in time the field of political agitation widened, and the extension of the franchise and a national system of education were taken up.

The "Taff Vale Decision."

In July, 1901, the British House of Lords delivered the famous "Taff Vale decision," which has had far-reaching and unlooked-for results. The immediate effect was to cause Trade Unionists generally to enter politics, not only individually, but collectively and officially, as Unions; and the ultimate consequence was virtually to cause an alliance between the Trade Unionists, as such, with the Socialists;—or, possibly a more correct way to state the case is to say that it led to the capture of the British Trade Unions by the out-and-out Socialists. And finally, the outcome of the public agitation and the Parliamentary pressure of the combined forces of Labor and Socialism, was the passage of the "Trades Dispute Act," in 1906,—a law which specially favors Trade Unionists above their fellow-citizens. This law and the causes which led to its passage are so mo-

mentous, that they call for a statement somewhat in detail—especially as that Act is held to be largely responsible for the extraordinary outburst of violence in the dock and railroads strikes of 1911.

In August, 1900, there was a strike on the Taff Vale Railway, in South Wales, the strikers being members of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. A suit was brought against members of the Union for persuading and intimidating workmen to break their contracts with the railroad company, and for aiding and abetting violence; and the court awarded damages to the extent of £23,000 (about $115,000). At first the railway company had sued the members of the Union individually, but, under a ruling of the court, the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants was made a party to the suit. On the award of the damages the Union appealed, and the decision was reversed; then the railway company appealed to the highest tribunal, the House of Lords;—and the decision of the first court was sustained. This decision, confirmed by the supreme judicial authority in the British Empire, did not affect Trade Unions in a criminal sense, but it held that they were not fully incorporated, and that they could be sued and cast in damages for the action of their agents, whenever this action was without justification and caused damage to other persons. Incidentally, it may be mentioned that the strike was entered into by members of the Union contrary to the wishes of the executive, although subsequently the Union supported it. The House of Lords held that the members of the Union were liable individually and that the association itself was also liable;—and it was on the latter holding that the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants was

compelled to pay £23,000 damages to the Taff Vale Railway Co. Not for many years had any decision of the highest court caused such a sensation and popular protest. While the case was in the lower court—but before a decision had been rendered—the Trade Unions had recognized its importance; and the National Congress of Unions issued an invitation to Labor and Socialists societies to join together in the formation of a "Labor Representation Committee," which was formed in 1900, and is a political committee to indorse and support Labor candidates nominated by its constituent Unions and societies. It is now the Labor Party, and is practically a Socialist organization. The following are the principal clauses of the Trades Disputes Act, passed in 1906—primarily for the express purpose of changing the law as laid down by the House of Lords in the Taff Vale decision—against most bitter protests on the part of the business and conservative elements of the country; and it is important to bear in mind that American organized Labor demands similar legislation:

1. An act done in pursuance of an agreement or combination by two or more persons shall, if done in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, not be actionable unless the act, if done without any agreement or combination, would be actionable.

2. It shall be lawful for one or more persons, acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union, or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near the house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working.

3. An act done by a person in contemplation of furtherance of a trade dispute shall not be actionable on the ground only that it induces some other person to break a contract of employment or that it is an interference with the trade, business, or employment of some other person, or with the right of some other person to dispose of his capital or his labor as he wills.

4. An action against a trade union, whether of workmen or masters, or against any members or officials thereof on behalf of themselves and all other members of the trade union in respect of any tortious act alleged to have been committed by or on behalf of the trade union, shall not be entertained by any court.

Labor Revolt, August, 1911.

The month of August, 1911, saw the greatest Labor strike in British history, and it was accompanied by such violence as to border on civil war. The trouble commenced by strikes of seamen, followed by dockers, both of which classes of workers received substantial concessions as a result of their revolt against conditions which were intolerable from an American standpoint; but the victory was sullied by dastardly personal outrages and destruction of property. While these strikes were in progress, the railroad men "came out" on demands for the redress of grievances and the recognition of the union, and in so doing they plainly violated an agreement they had entered into, under the Conciliatory Act of 1907. An epidemic of "sympathetic" strikes broke out all over the country, and an avowed attempt was made to paralyze all industry and to starve the nation into recognition of the demands. The Government were compelled to use regular troops in London, Liverpool and other large cities, and a number of sanguinary conflicts occurred, in which several

lives were lost. In Wales assaults were made upon the Jews, on the charge that they practiced usury and raised the price of food during the strikes. At first popular sympathy was with the strikers, because it was generally recognized that Labor was not getting its fair share of the profits of industry; but this sentiment of good-will was alienated when the strikes took the form of violence against individuals, destruction of property and revolt against constituted authority. Just as an "universal strike" was about to be declared, peace was restored by the employers partially recognizing the unions and the Government appointing a Commission of Enquiry. After making all allowance for the inevitable excitement and demoralization incidental to nearly all strikes on a large scale, there can be no doubt that the unparalleled outburst of excesses was owing to the bitter "class-conscious" feeling engendered within recent years by the absorption of Socialism on the part of Trade Unionists; indeed, the whole affair, in its exhibition of fierce revolutionary spirit and its almost fanatical manifestation of Labor "solidarity," was more like a demonstration of French "Syndicalism" than of British Trade Unionism. Early in September the British Trade Unions held their annual convention; the Government were denounced for using the troops, and a resolution was passed demanding the "nationalization" of the railroads. It is significant that the Irish railroad men refused to strike, and one of the reasons given was that the movement was a Socialistic one. Subsequently, on a trivial issue, there was a strike on the part of some of the Irish railroad men, but it soon collapsed.

The New York *Sun* of September 10, 1911, contained a long letter from its London correspondent reviewing

the evidence taken before the Royal Commission of Enquiry. It appeared that the men charged bad faith on the part of the employers in regard to the operation of the Conciliatory Board of 1907, which they denounced as worthless; it also appeared that the Trade Union leaders were doubtful whether the members would accept any finding of an Arbitration Board if it was adverse to their demands; it was also plain that the British Trade Unionists are now dominated by an extreme "class-conscious" feeling and are also embued with a spirit of not only national but international "solidarity." The correspondent proceeded to say:

> The new strike may still be in a sense a labor revolt, the fight of the workers for better conditions, but its inspiration is political and there seems good reason to believe international. The politics, moreover, are those of Continental Socialism, vague, ill-formed and violent. In an interview published to-day, H. M. Hyndman, practically the founder and certainly the most distinguished member of the Socialist Party in England, says: "I have preached class hatred for thirty years. . . . We are at war—civil war." . . . As to the international element in the industrial situation, Tom Mann (one of the prominent strike leaders) has openly boasted that he and his friends are part of a great Continental and American confederation. "Before the English strike broke out," writes the Berlin correspondent of the *Standard* (London), "Herr Jochade, the German President of the Transport Union, was in possession of the full programme of the English strikers." . . . It is certain that in England the day of the combined strike has arrived. The international strike is only another step, if a big one.

Since the strike, a movement has developed all over Great Britain among not only employers but conservative citizens of all classes, irrespective of party, as well as among the non-unionist wage-earners (who com-

prise probably three-fourths of the entire number of the workingmen of the country), for the repeal, or at least an amendment, of the clauses granting special privileges to organized labor under the new Trades Disputes Act as to "picketing" and the exemption of Trade Union funds for damages.

American Political-Labor Movement.

The American Labor movement has had a phase in its development which has been absent in Great Britain, and that is in the existence of an intermediate character of organization between Trade Unionism and Socialism. These organizations have been rather general in their membership (although mostly confined to manual workers), as also in their objects, they aiming at economic changes through political action, as well as through the "permeation" of public opinion, as the English Fabians say.

It is a curious fact that the Political-Labor movement in America was started by two young Englishmen, brothers—George Henry and Frederick W. Evans, who came to this country in 1820. They were adherents of the Owen movement, and as soon as they landed in America they plunged headlong into the Labor campaign, which soon assumed an aggressive form. At Ithaca, N. Y., George Henry Evans, in about 1822, started *The Man,* the first labor paper published in America; he next issued *The Workingman's Advocate,* at New York, in 1825-30: and in 1853 he started *Young America.* At the head of the latter paper Editor Evans printed the first distinctively Labor platform ever constructed,—at least in America—and as such it is of peculiar interest, its planks being as follows:

First. The right of man to the soil. "Vote yourself a farm;"

Second. Down with monopolies, especially the United States Bank;

Third. Freedom of public lands;

Fourth. Homesteads made inalienable;

Fifth. Abolition of all laws for the collection of debts;

Sixth. A general bankrupt law;

Seventh. A lien of the laborer upon his work for his wages;

Eighth. Abolition of imprisonment for debt;

Ninth. Equal rights for women with men in all respects;

Tenth. Abolition of chattel slavery, and of wages slavery;

Eleventh. Land limitation to one hundred and sixty acres; no person after the passage of this law to become possessed of more than that amount of land; but when a land monopolist died, his heirs were to take each his legal number of acres, and be compelled to sell the surplus, using the proceeds as they pleased;

Twelfth. Mails in the United States to run on the Sabbath.

These demands are said to have been endorsed by over 600 papers in the United States, and they were the basis of the Workingmen's Party, which held the first Labor-political convention ever held in the United States, at Syracuse, N. Y.; but the party was soon absorbed by the "Locofoco" or anti-monopolist movement.

The first truly national organization for the agitation of specific Labor demands was the National Labor Union, which held its first convention at Baltimore, Md., in 1866. It is said that this organization worked on a preconcerted plan in alliance with the Continental "International;" but it refused to adopt a resolution presented by a German-American Socialist of the Lassalle

school, in favor of independent political action. Hillquit, the American Socialist writer, says, with evident disgust, that although the National Labor Union sent a delegate to the International Convention, in 1869, it never joined that Communist body, "and never developed into a genuine class-conscious workingmen's party." In 1872 the Union, in conjunction with the Farmers' Alliance, nominated Presidential candidates, thus going clear over into the political field; but this action caused the collapse of the organization, thereby showing—what has a number of times since been confirmed—the traditional dislike of American Trade Unionists to enter the political arena as organizations; but, as pointed out a number of times, after-developments show that this attitude has considerably changed within recent years.

The most famous Labor organization in the world was the Knights of Labor, when that society was at its zenith—say in 1886-7. In the days of its great prominence there was much discussion as to whether it was a Socialist body, this suspicion arising largely because of the fact that for some time it was a secret society. Strictly speaking, it cannot be classed as being Socialist, although some of its principles are identical with "immediate demands" of the Marxian organizations. Indeed, it is said that a Christian Socialist named George E. McNeill, drew up the first platform of the Knights of Labor; but he was also the "father" of the American Federation of Labor, and all through its career that remarkable organization has stood aloof from Socialism, although of late years it has shown indications of yielding to the ever-increasing pressure. According to a story given by Hillquit in his *History of*

Socialism, the origin of the Knights of Labor was no less a Socialist source than the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels. The story is that U. S. Stephens, one of the founders and the first Grand Master Workman of the order, used this document largely in the preparation of the declaration of the principles of the Knights. But, however this may be, the preamble to those principles declared that the organization was not a political one.

There have been a number of other Labor-political organizations which have had principles akin to the "immediate demands" of out-and-out Socialists, such as the Greenback Party; but they only represented a passing phase of popular discontent with existing economic conditions, and cannot properly be called Socialist. As a matter of fact, one of the most important of these movements, "Henry Georgeism," while extremely "radical" on the one question of the taxation of land values, is looked upon by strict Socialists in America as supporting the present competitive system of industry, and therefore as being anti-Socialist; and Henry George himself was unequivocally opposed to Marxian Socialism, he looking upon it as unsound and impracticable. But British Socialists have accepted both "Henry Georgeism" and land nationalism.

The Federation of Labor and Socialism.

It is a significant fact that nearly all the great Labor and Trade Union leaders in America have been in the past opposed to philosophic Socialism, although, of course, they have been earnest advocates of social reform. Among these may be mentioned Henry George, Terence V. Powderly, Arthur, John McBride, and the

two most representative American Trade Union leaders now living, Samuel Gompers and John Mitchell.

Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, has been bitterly denounced by Socialists, and on the occasion of his last visit to England and the Continent (in the summer of 1909), he was "exposed" by American "comrades" in the party press of those countries; and the American Socialist journals have sneered at his pretensions as the "envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary" of the Labor organizations of this country.

John Mitchell, who was formerly President of the United Mine Workers of America, and is now Vice-President of the American Federation of Labor, states as follows, in his admirable book, *Organized Labor,* the position of American trade unionists as to "wage slavery"—the term applied by Socialists to the conditions under the present system of compensation of labor:

> Trade unionism is not based upon a necessary opposition to the so-called "wage slavery" of the present time. By the phrase "wage slavery" is usually meant a condition of practical enslavement, brought about, not by legal, but by economic subjection, a slavery enforced, not by the lash, but by pangs of hunger. The trade unionist recognizes that in certain sections of the country and in certain industries, the wage-earners, especially women and children, are in a condition so debased and degraded, and are so subject to oppression and exploitation, that it practically amounts to slavery. Where such slavery exists, however, trade unionism is opposed to the slavery as such, and not to the wages as such. Trade unionism is not irrevocably committed to the maintenance of the wage system, nor is it irrevocably committed to its abolition . . . and if it were ultimately to be shown that the system is incompatible with a high standard of living and a full development of the capabilities

> of the American workingman, the hosts of organized labor would unite in an effort to secure its abolition.

As to the relations of the American Federation of Labor to Socialism, Mr. Mitchell says, in the same book:

> Numerous attempts have been made by Socialist members of the Federation to secure control of the body and to commit it to the Socialist platform; but their efforts have been unsuccessful. The trade unions and the Federation of Labor itself stand for a number of reforms contained in the platform of the Socialist party; but the great majority of the members, whatever their political sympathies, refuse to permit the Federation to be committed to any definite political party, existing or to be formed.

At the convention of the Federation of Labor in 1885, Socialist members of the organization for the first time introduced a resolution advocating independent political action; but the resolution was defeated. It is said that of the 107 delegates who originally formed the Federation of Labor in 1886, only six were outspoken Socialists. Mr. Hillquit (who, it is well to remember in this connection, is an avowed Socialist) says in his *History*, that Mr. Gompers, who has been from the first the President, was at the formation "very friendly to Socialism," although he "in later years was its most decided opponent." In his biography in the *Encyclopedia of Social Reform* (which may be considered semi-official), Mr. Gompers' position is thus defined: "He is not opposed to the aims of Socialism, though not committed to its views, and he believes in political action on the part of Labor, but holds that the main hope of Labor is in the Trade-Union movement and that to commit that

movement to any political party or endeavor would be to disrupt it and hurt it irremediably."

There have always been a certain number of delegates to the conventions of the Federation who have been Socialists. At the convention of the Federation in 1890 the question was very vigorously discussed. It seems that some time before the convention, President Gompers had refused a charter to the Central Labor Federation of New York, on the ground that affiliated with that body was a "section" of the Socialist Labor Party; and as the latter organization was decidedly political, Mr. Gompers' argument was that the Central Labor Federation of New York had itself become affiliated with politics. This, he ruled, made the New York Central Labor Federation ineligible for membership in the American Federation of Labor, as the latter organization is prohibited by its constitution from affiliation with political parties. In reply, the Socialist Labor Party claimed that it was an organization devoted to Labor interests exclusively, and that its participation in politics was only incidental. But that really seemed like quibbling. The vote in the American Federation of Labor on the question as to whether the New York body should be admitted, stood:—for, 535; against, 1699; and Mr. Hillquit thinks that that vote was probably a good test of the strength of Socialism in the Federation at that time.

At the convention of the Federation in 1893, at Chicago, a delegate, who was also a member of the Socialist Labor Party, introduced a resolution eulogizing the Trade Unionists of Great Britain for having taken independent political action, endorsing that action on the part of "our British comrades," and submitting to the

Labor organizations of America a proposition involving a similar programme and basis of political action, with the request that the delegates to the succeeding convention of the Federation be instructed to vote upon this subject. This resolution was adopted. There is some dispute as to the facts of the sequel. At the convention of 1894, when the question came up in accordance with the preceding action, and a vote was about to be taken on one of the political planks—that favoring "the collective ownership by the people of all means of production and distribution"—a substitute was offered, demanding that public lands should only be granted to actual tillers of the soil; and the substitute was adopted. At four successive conventions resolutions in favor of Socialism were introduced, but were not adopted. At the last of these (in 1898) the Federation defined its position as follows:

> We hold that the trade unions of America, as comprised in the American Federation of Labor, do not now, and never have, declared against discussion of economic and political questions in the meetings of the respective unions. We are committed against the endorsement or introduction of partisan politics, religious differences, or race prejudice. We hold it to be the duty of trade unionists to study and discuss all questions that have any bearing upon their industrial or political liberty.

In 1890 the Socialist Labor Party officially withdrew their "sympathy and support" from the American Federation of Labor, on account of the latter's refusal to endorse Socialism; and in 1895 it severed all connection with the Knights of Labor for the same reason.

At the Convention of the Federation in 1910 a threatened opposition on the part of the Socialists to the reelection of Mr. Gompers as President, failed to mate-

rialize; and another threatened demonstration failed in 1911.

Socialist Criticism of the Federation.

Morris Hillquit may be said to be the historian and chief literary advocate of Marxist Socialism of the strictest sect in America. He was the representative of the American Socialist Party at the International Socialist Congress, held at Stuttgart, Germany, August 18, 1907, and he there made a report on "Recent Progress of the Socialist and Labor movements in the United States." He noted that the American Federation of Labor, "the largest body of American workingmen, for the first time in its existence of a quarter of a century, violated its vow of political neutrality, when it interfered in the congressional elections of 1906." Mr. Hillquit was sarcastically critical as to the attitude of the Federation of Labor towards politics generally and especially towards Socialism. In his report to the International Socialist Congress he informed the delegates that instead of entering organized working-class politics, the Federation had sought favors from State Legislatures and the Federal Congress by "lobbying methods." The fruits of that activity have, he claimed, been very meagre indeed, and the courts had slaughtered one Labor law after another. Following lack of action by the President of the United States and by Congress to the "bill of grievances" of Labor, presented by the Federation, that organization took part in the Congressional campaign of 1906, opposing those candidates for re-election who had not favored Labor measures in Congress. But, says our Socialist critic: "Unfortunately the campaign was conducted by the officers of

the Federation on the lines of the short-sighted, half-hearted policy, which always characterized their political views and actions. . . . And the result was that the greatest Labor organization with its two million members and tremendous powers in the world of workers, made a lamentable poor debut in politics. However, the mere entry of the Federation in politics was a fact full of significance."

Mr. Hillquit proceeded in his report to the International convention to set forth the present attitude of American Socialism towards organized Labor, and particularly toward the Federation of Labor. He recounted the past efforts of the Socialists to induce the Federation to take up separate political action, and he mentioned that they were successful to a certain extent, as in 1886 a national convention of the Federation adopted a resolution urging its members "to give cordial support to the independent political movements of the working class." Then he adds:

> These efforts on the part of the Socialists were perfectly natural at a time when the political organization of Socialism had not much more than a nominal existence in the United States, and practically the entire strength of organized labor was represented by the trade union movement. But when the Socialist party had commenced to demonstrate its ability to organize the working class of the country politically on the clear-cut lines of international socialism, the wisdom of forcing the creation of a rival political party of labor, of a presumably less satisfactory character, began to be seriously questioned. The Socialists in the American Federation of Labor have accordingly abandoned the efforts to "capture" the Federation bodily, and have transferred their energies to the task of educating the individual trade unionists, in local meetings and state and national conventions, in the proper understanding of the Socialist philosophy.

Mr. Hillquit complains that "In all discussions on Socialism on the floor of the Federation conventions, Mr. Samuel Gompers and other officers and leaders of the organization, invariably took the somewhat antiquated position of 'pure and simple' trade unionism and occasionally evinced a very decided hostility towards the Socialist movement."

So likewise, the Socialists endeavored to capture the Knights of Labor. As a preliminary, they induced a number of Socialist Germans and Jews to join the Knights, and an "Assembly" of these men was formed in New York known as the "Excelsior Club;" and in 1893 the Socialist Labor Party obtained control of the New York "District Assembly of the Knights of Labor." The Socialist members of the Knights made it so uncomfortable for Terence V. Powderly, as Grand Master Workman, that in 1893 he vacated that office after having held it for fourteen years. The Knights identified themselves with politics, and some of the planks of their platform are in the direction of "State Socialism," but it has not formally identified itself with Socialism, and has resisted successfully the efforts of the Socialist Labor Party to capture it. In fact, from 1895 there has been open antagonism between the Knights of Labor and the Socialist Labor Party. When this antagonism came to a head, a number of members of the Knights of Labor seceded and formed the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, as an "annex" to the Socialist Labor Party; and in form of organization it was an exact copy of the Knights of Labor. Although it granted charters to 200 labor organizations, the Alliance was a failure from the very start, and it now exists only in name.

CHAPTER V

UTOPIANISM

Whatever is deemed to be idealistically impracticable is called "Utopian." To the Individualist, Socialism in general is impracticable;—to him, therefore, it is Utopian. But to the student, and particularly to the adherent of Marxism, Utopian Socialism has a special, definite meaning:—the application of idealistic and arbitrary theories of government to industrial production and communal possession and distribution of goods, and also to social relations, by voluntary association.

Scientific Socialists recognize the value of Utopianism as demonstrating, up to a certain point, the advantages of co-operative effort, but they deny that it is Socialism proper.

Utopian Romances.

The Utopians are of two kinds:—the theorists purely, and those who put their theories into practice. The theorists have generally expressed their ideals of the perfect political and social community in the form of romances,—which were the "parents of golden dreams"—and sometimes in a philosophical or an expository form. Utopian communistic schemes have found advocates in almost every age, and in many countries.

The most classic of the idealization of Utopianism is the *Republic* of the Greek Philosopher, Plato, who was

born more than 400 years before Christ. His system was the most extreme form of the subordination of the individual to the State; it was one of "extravagant Communism and smiling Optimism," a combination of the speculative and the practical. It provided for the care of children by the State instead of by their parents; it established public education; prescribed regulations as to marriage; it restricted the number of births; it laid down regulations as to the occupations of citizens, these occupations being controlled by the State; and while "equality of opportunity" was given to all—to women as to men—citizens were divided into classes according to capacity.

The use of the word "Utopian," as applied to the idealization of Communism or Socialism, comes from a romance by Sir Thomas More, the great Lord Chancellor of England during part of the reign of King Henry VIII. The romance was published in 1516, its title being *Utopia*. The meaning of the word is *nowhere*, and its application to the romance is obvious, as the book describes an imaginary island, the inhabitants of which held philosophical, religious, and communistic views which were remarkable considering the age in which *Utopia* was written. In addition to a popular democratic government, Utopian citizens had a community of goods, meals in common, and freedom of creed; and there was monogamy in the marriage relation. There was no money, and gold and silver were considered to be fit only for the baser uses. All save the old and infirm had to work six hours a day. Criminals were enslaved, and had to perform the most laborious and disagreeable work. Once every ten years the citizens chose their houses by lot.

The New Atlantis, by Lord Bacon, is a similar work to *Utopia.* It describes an imaginary island, on which the narrator was wrecked, and where was found a most perfect philosophical government, bent on the cultivation of the natural sciences.

The City of the Sun, by Tomaso Campanella, resembles Plato's *Republic,* and some critics say that it is an imitation of the great Athenian's masterpiece. Campanella (who was born in 1568) was a brilliant but sadly unfortunate Italian philosopher. For reasons which are not clear (but probably partly political and partly ecclesiastical), the authorities cast him into a dungeon at Naples; he remained there for 27 years, and was tortured on the rack seven times to force him to confess to heresy, but without avail. *The City of the Sun* was an ideal republic combined with a system of theocratic Communism. As in Plato's *Republic,* there was a community of wives as well as of goods; and there was also State control of population. Campanella and his fellow-countryman, Telesio, are sometimes designated as "the predecessors of Bacon."

A much more modern Utopian romance than any of the above, is *The Voyage in Icaria,* by Étienne Cabet, the founder of the Icarian communities in the United States. Cabet was born in Dijon, France, in 1788. He was a revolutionary Communist, and being given the choice of two years' imprisonment or five years of exile, he chose the latter, and went to England—that refuge of so many political and ecclesiastical exiles, both good and bad. After his return to France he published his *Voyage en Icarie,* which described the visit of a young Englishman to the far-off country of Icaria, and the story is the journal of his adventures and discoveries.

The government of Icaria was that of a democratic commonwealth, with co-operative industrialism, progressive income tax, State regulation of wages, national workshops, agricultural colonies, political freedom, liberal education, and equality of the sexes. Alone among all Socialists, Utopian or Scientific, Cabet undertook to settle one of the most difficult of the many problems arising from any proposed system of Collectivism, viz., that relating to the publication of newspapers. Cabet decided that there should not be any newspapers allowed—but only one official journal!

It is not necessary to give an outline of the most modern and the most popular of all Utopian romances —Bellamy's *Looking Backward* and its sequel *Equality,* as both books have such a wide current circulation. The economic principles so picturesquely presented in *Looking Backward* were formulated into an economic scheme and party in the United States called "Nationalism," which was, in a way, a rival to Marxian Socialism, and was much opposed by the followers of the latter. Bellamy himself described Nationalism as "industrial self-government." The system was a combination of Opportunism and Idealism; it was Socialist in the sense that it involved the nationalization of industry and the communal ownership of property; but the Marxian philosophy of the materialistic conception of history and of the class struggle had no place in it; consequently, Nationalism is not considered genuine Scientific Socialism, but simply a form of Utopianism. For a short time the Nationalist Party aroused great interest and enthusiasm, but ultimately it was merged into the Populist or People's Party. But, short-lived as it was, Nationalism had much to do with popularizing Socialism

in America, as well as in England, where *Looking Backward* had an enormous number of readers.

Experimental Utopianism.

So far as common ownership and common distribution of goods are concerned, Experimental Utopian Socialism is not a modern idea. Passing over the communal societies of the Roman Catholic Church, and those of the dissenting sects, from the days of primitive Christianity, there were a number of attempts to establish Ideal Communism both prior to and immediately after the Reformation.

The Anabaptists in Germany, before they developed their sexual excesses, tried in many ways to put in practice a true Communism.

The "Brethren of the Common Life" (or, "Brethren of the Common Lot," or, "Brethren of the Social Life," as they were differently called), were founded in 1376 in Holland. They practiced Communism in goods, and in 1430 there were 130 societies.

The "Libertines" were a sort of Anarchists, in the 16th century, who were opposed to Calvin's dictatorship.

Early in the 16th century there was a group of Communists in Holland called "Familists" or "Davidists;" and there was also a body of French Socialists called "Familists."

One of the most interesting and successful enterprises ever undertaken by the Order of Jesuits was the establishment of a number of communistic settlements, or "reductions," as they were called, in the South American country of Paraguay, in the early part of the 17th century. These "reductions" were established by virtue

of a privilege conferred on the Jesuits by Pope Gregory XIII, licensing them to engage in commerce. The settlements were gradually extended over the country watered by the Parana and the Uruguay, and continued to flourish until the Order of Jesuits was suppressed in 1767. The plan of government of the "reductions" was parochial, it being administered entirely by the parish clergy. The native Indians were collected into villages, each village having its church and curate, who was assisted by several priests. All property was held in common, the food supplies produced by each settlement being stored in magazines, from which each family were given enough for their wants, special provision being made for aged persons, widows and orphans, and the sick. The surplus of the products was sold by agents at Buenos Ayres, and the receipts were used partly in paying taxes to the king, and partly in buying ornaments for the church, and the remainder in purchasing articles of necessity which the settlers could not manufacture for themselves. In 1732 there were thirty villages or parishes under the care of the missionaries, containing a population of 141,000. This was probably the most successful attempt at Communism since the days of classic Athens; and like the much-vaunted Socialism of that time, the Communism of the "reductions" of Paraguay was undemocratic: for, while classic Athenian Socialism was based on the slavery of the vast majority of the population, the Communism of Paraguay had its strength on the servility of the entire working people (the indolent, ignorant and superstitious aborigines) toward their Jesuit instructors and guardians. Well-informed Socialists of the present day concede that the Paraguay experiment is not to be

taken as a demonstration of the practicability of Collectivism among an intelligent and a civilized people under modern conditions; and Victor Cathrein, who himself is a Jesuit, remarks in his *Socialism* (which is the standard Roman Catholic refutation of Marxism): "The reductions of Paraguay, which are frequently set up as models of communism, were not strictly communistic, and were destined only to be institutions of a transitory character."

Secular Societies.

Coming down to the period covered by the last hundred years or so, there have been a great many voluntary associations, the main features of which have been co-operative labor and a communal division of products, either according to earnings or according to needs. A few of these communal associations have lasted a century; some of them have struggled on for half a century, and then died out; and not a few have had an existence of only a dozen or even a shorter number of years.

As a rule, the sectarian societies have been the most successful:—they have kept together the longest, have acquired the most property, and have had the most harmonious existence. Of the secular, purely industrial communities, most of them have been short-lived; they have had a hard struggle with poverty, and have, as a rule, been conspicuous for dissensions.

Comte de Claude Henri Saint-Simon (or simply, Saint-Simon, as generally named) was one of the historic founders of Socialism, sharing that honor with his fellow-countryman, Fourier, and with his British contemporary, Robert Owen. Saint-Simon's theories

undoubtedly influenced the growth and establishment of socialistic ideas on the Continent and in England; and probably they had some indirect effect in America, although his European experiments in practical Socialism had no counterpart over here. Still, his name is closely connected with the United States, for when he was only 17 years of age he came to America and fought under Washington against the British. Later he visited Mexico, and projected a plan for uniting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by a canal across the Isthmus of Panama; and he also advocated the Suez Canal. It is an interesting coincidence that the unfortunate Vicomte de Lesseps, who built the Suez Canal and commenced the Panama Canal, was a follower of Saint-Simon in his Socialist theories. Saint-Simon is sometimes called "the first Christian Socialist." After failing to persuade the Pope to establish a new social economic order, he started a system of social theology of his own, which he styled the "New Christianity." Saint-Simon, like Fourier and Owen, held that a constitutional monarchy is not necessarily incompatible with Socialism. [Some of the British Opportunist Socialists of these times practically hold the same views, although theoretically they are Republicans.] All of Fourier's experiments were confined to France, and they collapsed after a few years, through divisions over the sexual relations.

Not only was Robert Owen the first to approximately see the relation of social problems to the "industrial revolution" which had taken place, but he was also the pioneer of secular Utopian Socialism. But, earnest as Owen was, and supported actively as he was by able and influential men on both sides of the Atlantic, all

his experiments turned out failures. He established communities in Lanarkshire, Scotland; in County Clare, Ireland; in Hampshire, England; and then he turned his attention to America. In 1803 George Rapp, the leader of a German religious sect, came to the United States, and established a communal society in Pennsylvania, and in 1814 it moved to Posey County, Ind., on the Wabash River, where it founded a settlement named New Harmony. Ten years later Owen bought the estate for $150,000; and in that year (1824) he came to America to re-organize the society, and to start it on its career as the first example in secular industrial Utopian Socialism. Owen was received with great enthusiasm by the American people, his fame as a reformer having preceded him. He made speeches in a number of the large cities, and at Washington the use of the Hall of the House of Representatives was granted him for an address, at which were present not only members of the Senate and House, but the President of the United States and the President-elect, and the Judges of the Supreme Court. Although the re-organization of the community at New Harmony was made under the most favorable auspices, it did not live very long—only eighteen months or so.

In addition to the community at New Harmony, the "Owenites" had settlements at Yellow Springs, Ohio; at Nashoba, on the Wolf River, north of Memphis, Tenn.; and at Haverstraw, N. Y.,—afterwards at Kendal, near Canton, Ohio. The community in Tennessee was largely philanthropic, and was especially for the education of negroes.

The most remarkable theories and the most extensive experiments in connection with Utopian Socialism were

those which were the conception of François Charles Marie Fourier, the third of the great trio who were really the originators of the basic ideas of Modern Socialism. Under Fourier's system every worker could have a capital of his own, and he could transfer his services from one community to another. The characteristic idea of his system was a supposed "harmony" which existed between all created things, and the requirement that all human instincts and desires should have free exercise and development. To carry out his theories, Fourier divided mankind into "groups" or "phalanxes," each of these being the social unit. The "phalanx" was to be grouped around the "phalanstery,"—a double row of continuous buildings, of which the principal one was the "palace." Work was to be done on the co-operative plan; the minimum of subsistence was guaranteed to every member of the "phalanx," this being taken out of the common product of the labor of all the members; and what was left was to be divided between labor, capital, and "talent." Private capital was admitted, but it was under communal control. It is strange that only two "phalanxes" were established in France, and they soon failed. But Fourierism became quite a "cult" in the United States, and there was a wide-spread feeling among even intellectual men that at last a practical solution of the industrial and social-economic problems of the age had been discovered. The man who introduced the fantastic theories of Fourier into America was the noted social reformer, Albert Brisbane. Previous to taking up Fourierism, Brisbane had been a follower of Saint-Simon. As Brisbane presented Fourierism to his fellow-countrymen, he modified it with the view of meeting American conditions and tendencies.

The "phalanxes" were sometimes known in America as "associations." Impracticable as Fourierism is now universally conceded to be, it was adopted and advocated by some of the most famous men of the day in America, among them being: Horace Greeley, the famous editor of the New York *Tribune;* Park Godwin, the noted journalist; Charles Dana, the brilliant editor of the New York *Sun;* Nathaniel Hawthorne, America's greatest novelist; Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theodore Parker, T. W. Higginson, Henry James, James Russell Lowell, and the two well-known Unitarian ministers, George Ripley and William Henry Channing. Margaret Fuller, the intellectual "transcendentalist," also supported the movement. With the single exception of the anti-slavery agitation, probably no propaganda in this country ever had enrolled in its advocacy such a remarkable galaxy of contemporary leaders of public thought, as Fourierism had in the height of its popularity. Of the numerous "phalanxes" established in the United States, the most famous were those known as "Brook Farm," near Boston, and the "North American," at Red Bank, Monmouth County, N. J. "Brook Farm" was established in 1842, and lasted only six years; the "North American" phalanx was founded in 1843, and was in existence for a dozen years. Other associations were organized in the States of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan. A number of State conventions were held, and in 1844 a National convention met; but Fourierism only lasted a little over a decade in the United States, and to-day the movement is almost forgotten. Yet John Stuart Mill declared (*Political Economy*) that Fourierism was "the most

skillfully combined, and with the greatest foresight of objections, of all the forms of socialism."

The Icarian movement, like Fourierism, originated in France, although it had its application exclusively in the United States. The Icarian experiments were started to carry out the theories of Étienne Cabet, as set forth in his romance, *Voyage in Icaria.* The interest in his book grew to such an extent, that in 1847 Cabet published a proclamation to the workingmen of France headed "Allons en Icarie!"—("Let us go to Icaria!") This appeal met with an enthusiastic response, and Cabet contracted for a million acres of land in Texas, and an advance guard of Icarians left Havre in February, 1848. This experiment was a pathetic failure, and after a succession of disappointments and harsh experiences and dissensions, Cabet himself was actually expelled from the society, and in 1895 the last trace of the Icarian Community disappeared. And yet, there are Scientific Socialists who say that Icarianism was a nearer approach to the modern conception of the Co-operative Commonwealth than were any of the other attempts of Utopian Communism; but, as with Fourierism, the chief trouble seems to have been "the unregenerate residuum in human nature."

Sectarian Communism.

Although the sectarian communities have been more successful than the purely secular associations, yet but few of them have become permanent organizations—at least as they were originally founded. Several of them have been reorganized into joint stock concerns,—and as such, are "capitalistic," and are, therefore, in opposition to the fundamental idea of true Socialism. With

one exception (the Oneida Community), all the sectarian associations (or, at any rate, all those of any prominence) are of alien origin. One of the first of these religious Communistic bodies to be founded in the United States was the "Shakers," which has had a longer successful life, as a community, than any of its followers. Fundamental principles of the "Shakers" are: virgin purity, non-resistance, peace, equality in inheritance, and the non-marriage state, the married people being divorced, and the single remaining in that condition. The members of this singular community are called "Shakers" because of their violent contortions after the supposed reception of revelations from the spirit world. There are now some fifteen communities, scattered throughout nine States. They have the reputation of being very wealthy, they owning 100,000 acres of land; but for all that the "Shakers" are dying out. The principle of Communism is not general, it applying only to members of the family; and some families are wealthy, while others are poor.

The Oneida Community was founded by John Humphrey Noyes, who was born in Vermont, in 1811. During the great revival of 1831 he became "converted," and was ordained a minister of the Congregational Church; but owing to his peculiar views on religion and on the relation between the sexes he was constrained to resign from the ministry; however, he still continued to preach. In 1834 he went to the residence of his parents, at Putney, Vt., where he started a community of followers of his extraordinary doctrines. Considering his unorthodox views in regard to the sexes, it is astonishing that among the membership of the community were his own mother, two of his sisters, and

several others of his relatives. All the men of the community were considered to be the "husbands" of all the female members; and, in turn, all the women were considered to be the "wives" of all the male members—a combination of polygamy and polyandry. The men and women of the community cohabited promiscuously, but any man or woman had the right to decline any unwelcome "attention." It was a system of the "freest" kind of "free love." At first the organization was only a religious association, but very soon communism in goods was adopted; and then commonality as to women followed as a logical application of the Communistic doctrine. The followers of Noyes called themselves "Perfectionists." They undertook to propagate children scientifically, and one way of doing this was for a young man to mate with a woman of mature years, and *vice versa*. As can be readily imagined, these practices caused intense local opposition; and on this account Noyes and his community moved in 1848 to Oneida, Madison County, N. Y. After a time several other "Perfectionist" communities were established, but in 1857 they were all aggregated at Oneida and at Wallingford, Connecticut. The members of these communities were considerably above the average of like bodies in intelligence, social standing, and in the wealth which they contributed to the common fund; and they established a splendid reputation for their honesty and for the excellence of their farm and industrial products. Owing to the bitter opposition of the orthodox churches, the "Perfectionists" abandoned their system of "complex marriages" in 1879. This step, however, led to the dissolution of the community as such, and Noyes with a few adherents emigrated to Canada, where he died

in 1886. In 1880 the remnants of the community were incorporated as a joint stock company, under the name of "Oneida Community, Limited," and it is understood that the assets of the concern amounted to the value of one million dollars. It is only fair to state that the members of Noyes' community denied the charge of lustful licentiousness, and they insisted that every one had to be "perfect"—that is, to be "free from sin," and to be "holy"—before being allowed to practice "liberty of love."

The "Rappists" or "Harmonites" had a sort of dual foundership, there having been two different associations bearing that name—one in Lycoming County, Pa., and the other on the River Wabash, Posey County, Ind. The first community—which was in Germany—was sectarian, the members being known as "Separatists" (because they separated from the orthodox churches), and its founder emigrated to America with a company of followers. After being for some time in Pennsylvania, the "Rappists" sold out and moved to Indiana, and took up 30,000 acres of land, they calling this settlement New Harmony. In 1824-5 Robert Owen, the British reformer, purchased their land, and with the proceeds the "Rappists" bought a property near Pittsburg, Pa., to which they gave the name of Economy. They have dwindled down to a few old men, and the property of the community is vested in two trustees; and, in fact, the society is now a limited partnership, and employs a large number of wage earners. Owen's community had its separate career—and it was a very short one.

After the "Rappists" left Germany they were followed by another company of the same sect, who formed

the "Zoar" colony in the Tuscarawas Valley, Ohio. In April, 1819, the "Zoarites" adopted articles of association by which all the property of the individual members, and their future earnings, should become common. But in October, 1898, the Communistic nature of the society was abolished by a distribution of the property heretofore held in common, the experiment being a self-confessed failure.

There have been and are still a number of other sectarian and secular voluntary Communist associations in America, but the above are the most important. The following communities are still in existence after the period of years named when they were founded: The Ephrata Community, 178 years; the 15 Shaker Communities, 134 years; the Harmony Community, 67 years; the Oneida Community (now a joint stock company), 78 years. The entire movement has spent its force, however, and does not now attract any public attention.

CHAPTER VI

STATE AND MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM

Bismarck and State Socialism.

Socialists universally recognize Bismarck as their greatest antagonist in the active field of politics and state-craft. Yet it was no other than the great German Chancellor who in a famous speech made in the Reichstag in 1882 said:

> Many measures which we have adopted to the great blessing of the country are Socialistic, and the State will have to accustom itself to a little more Socialism yet. . . . But if you believe that you can frighten any one or call up specters with the word "Socialism," you take a standpoint which I abandoned long ago, and the abandonment of which is absolutely necessary for our entire Imperial legislation.

Nevertheless, Bismarck denied that he was a Socialist, as the term is generally understood; and during the period of his power he used the machinery of the State with great vigor to crush Socialism. It was State Socialism which Bismarck introduced as a part of the permanent Imperial policy; and his avowed object was to cause a cessation of the growing demand for Scientific, Revolutionary Socialism. Bismarck declared for "the right to work"—which is one of the principal of the "immediate demands" of the Socialists, the world over;

but in so doing he claimed that he was only standing on the old Prussian constitution, which dates in varying forms from 1671 to 1794, one of the clauses providing that the State must provide work for those of its citizens who could not procure subsistence for themselves. But Bismarck was mistaken in supposing that the establishment of State Socialism would cause a diminution in the agitation for Marxian Socialism. No other country has had State Socialism so extensively and scientifically engrafted on its constitution as Germany has, and in no other country is there such a wide-spread demand for extreme Revolutionary Socialism.

In the popular mind the two systems are often confounded, and it is undoubtedly sometimes difficult to draw a clear distinction as regards governmental action; and in the opinion of many Socialists the main difference is only that of *intent*. But, as a rule, Marxian Socialists are opposed—theoretically, at least—to State Socialism as a permanent system; in practice, however, they accept it as a means to an end—as a half-way house to the final goal,—to complete Collectivism; and, indeed, State Socialism, to a greater or less extent, is included in the "immediate demands" of most Socialist organizations throughout the world.

German Workmen's Insurance and Old-Age Pensions. Of all forms of State Socialism the most important in any country is that of the insurance of the working men of Germany. The German Ambassador at Washington, who is not given to much public speaking, has made several addresses in large American cities, expository and laudatory of the system. In *Harper's Monthly*, of October, 1909, Madge C. Jenison speaks of it as "the

big fact in Germany." This writer goes on to say: "Six out of nine of all those who work for wages are sure by law of an income and doctor's care if they are ill; three out of four when they are old or unable to work; and every man, woman, and child, except in a few isolated classes of workers, in cases of accidents met with in their trades." Old age pensions now begin at 70 years, and the age may soon be reduced five years. The State insurance is for accident, sickness, old age, and invalidism. Indemnity for accidents is granted irrespective of the culpability or innocence of either party. The pensions for accidents are maintained by employers alone, on the principle that "accidents are an inherent feature of industry and must be considered part of the cost of production;" and the accident pensions are paid by the trade associations of employers. The sickness and old-age insurance is borne by the employer and the employed together. Sickness insurance can be drawn for 26 weeks a year. Employers pay one-third of the premium for sickness, while each pays one-half for old-age and invalid pension—a much more commendable system than the scheme just introduced in England, where the State pays the entire amount of the old-age pension. The administration in Germany is conducted jointly by workmen and employers; and the contribution by the government about pays the cost of administration.

State Socialism Defined.

State Socialism can be defined as a system under which there is governmental action instead of private action in the ownership and operation of undertakings and the performance of certain functions for the gen-

eral good. These undertakings may cover transportation—the ownership and operation of canals, railroads, steamships, street cars, etc.; and they may be of a commerical or trading nature—supplying food, clothing, etc., or the providing of such public necessities and conveniences as are generally classed as "public utilities" (telegraphs, telephones, water, gas, electricity, etc.). State Socialism also includes the performance of such functions as the free feeding of school children, the providing of free school books, old-age pensions, life, sick and accident insurance, etc.; and "land nationalization,"—or the State ownership and control of productive land (that is, land apart from parks, thoroughfares, etc.)—is classed as State Socialism. There is an ever-increasing application of State Socialism to the ownership and control of local "public utilities," such as street cars, water, gas, electric lighting and power. This is generally called Municipal Socialism, or Municipal Trading; but as a matter of fact it is State Socialism in a municipal degree—State Socialism with a local application. Generally speaking, Municipal Socialism is confined to "public utilities," as above, which, by their very nature, are natural monopolies, or ought to be monopolies, for efficient and economical administration, whether owned publicly or by private corporations.

There is a line drawn by some economists in this regard between objects fairly to be included within State Socialism and those outside its proper sphere: that is, it is held that the State should not undertake any enterprise which is "productive" (which brings in a revenue), unless it comes within the category of "public utilities," and is a natural monopoly; in other words, that the State or municipality should not enter into

industrial and commercial undertakings except in special cases and for reasons which are overwhelming;—that the State or municipality should not enter into commercial or industrial competition with its citizens. It is upon this line that the battle is now being fought in England and on the Continent, with the object of limiting the sphere of operations of State Socialism.

State Socialism Through Taxing the Rich.

Government intervention in social politics is not a new thing in England, and the doctrine of *laissez faire* was not even held rigidly by Adam Smith and the "Manchester school." Until recently England was far behind some of the Continental countries in State Socialism, but she is fast catching up. The British Government owns the telegraph system; in the summer of 1909 it took over most of the Marconi wireless stations; and it now owns the telephone system; there is an active agitation proceeding for the nationalization of the railroads and canals; and long before Henry George went to England there were several schemes advocated for the nationalization of land, one of them embodying a plan similar to George's "single tax" as a *via media*. Rae observes that "German Socialists direct their attack mainly on capital, but English socialism fastens very naturally on property in land, which in England is concentrated into unnaturally few hands." But things have "moved" since Rae wrote that sentence. While the British Socialists attack private ownership in land just as strongly as ever they did, they have within the past ten years made a special attack on capital and "unearned" wealth in all its shapes—and "unearned" wealth, in the philosophy of the present-day Socialists,

is all wealth except the wages received by the working class. The British Socialists boldly proclaim that the rich should be compelled to provide for the necessities of the poor.

British Old-Age Pension Scheme.

On January 1, 1909, the British old-age pension scheme came into operation. There was a consensus of opinion that some system of pensions should be provided, the principal differences being as to whether they should be non-contributory or contributory (as in Germany, where, indeed, the employers and employees pay the full amount with the exception of the cost of administration), and as to the cost and provision therefor, if the system was non-contributory. The system adopted is not considered a satisfactory solution of the dreadful problem of the indigent aged poor in the United Kingdom. It is non-contributory, and there can be no reasonable doubt but that it will have a pauperizing effect on a large class of the population—this effect being not limited to the recipients, but being felt generally, as it will strengthen and encourage the recent and widely-extending feeling that the poor, and even the average working class, have a right to be provided for in their advancing years, and that there is no necessity for the practice of thrift, economy, or self-help. Indeed, this doctrine is openly proclaimed by Socialists. The present age required to entitle anyone to a pension is 70 years, but the Trade Unionists and Socialists are already demanding that the limit be 65, 60 and even 50 years. The amount of the pension is graded down from five shillings to one shilling a week, according to the private income of the recipient. For instance, if he has an

income of not more than eight shillings a week, he is entitled to a pension of five shillings a week; whereas, if he has an income up to twelve shillings a week, he is entitled to a pension of only one shilling a week; and if he has an income of over twelve shillings a week, he is not entitled to any pension. Voluntary provision for old age, through benefit societies, or Trade Unions, are not included in this disqualifying effect of private incomes. When the law was passed it was estimated by the government that £6,000,000 would be sufficient to meet these old-age pensions for a year; but it soon became evident that another million would have to be added; and the probabilities are that in a few years the old-age pension bill will amount to £10,000,000 or £12,000,000. The government is being continuously subjected to pressure from the Trade Unionists and the Socialists to reduce the age limit and to increase the weekly amount of the pension. While there is a general acceptance of the principle of old-age pensions on the part of the public, yet there is probably a majority sentiment against the non-contributory feature of the system, and there is a demand that that be changed; and there is a movement in favor of a contributory scheme for sick and accident insurance, similar to the German system.

In the middle of December, 1911, the British Parliament passed the National Insurance Bill providing for compulsory insurance against sickness and unemployment of the working classes. It is estimated that a capitalization fund of $135,000,000 will be required. It will be contributed to by the employers, the employees and the government. For the first three months an allow-

ance of $2.50 a week will be made, and half of that for the next three months.

Where the Money Comes From.

When the question is asked where the money to pay for the old-age pensions and the sick, unemployment and accident pensions, is to come from, the universal answer of the Labor-Socialists is that the State should provide the money, and that the State should get the money by taxing the rich. This doctrine is being openly advocated even to the point of confiscation of all wealth arising from rent, interest, or dividends. There are two methods of taxing the rich in Great Britain which heretofore have seemed bottomless in their capacity for yielding to the demands of the government for money —one the taxation of incomes, and the other that of making the estates of deceased persons pay tribute to the State. The present British income tax is normally one shilling on the pound, except that it is only ninepence on the whole or part thereof of an income less than £2,000 a year if the income be directly earned from a trade or profession (that is, not from dividends, etc.). Incomes not exceeding £160 a year are exempt from tax altogether, and there are abatements allowed up to incomes of £700. The whole theory of the British income tax system is to exempt the poor and even the average workingman, and to make the tax comparatively light on those of moderate income, but to tax heavily the wealthy. For the year 1907-8 the income tax receipts amounted to the enormous sum of £32,380,000. Another fat goose for the British government is the source of income known as the "death duties," or

taxation on inheritances. These duties are "progressive," and sometimes they eat up the income of an estate for three or four years; and in the meantime the incoming heir has to live in anticipation of the enjoyment of his fortune. The British Government is remorseless in collecting both the income tax and the death duties; and, speaking generally, there is no such thing as evading these taxes. The British Government will even follow up, say an American who has temporarily resided in England, entered into a business there, received an income therefrom but has spent far more than his income in living expenses; and then, when he has returned home to America to remain permanently, the tax collectors will pursue him to this country, with peremptory demands for payment of income tax for the fraction of the year he had resided in England after the last full year for which he had paid the tax. Not only that, but an alien, temporarily resident in England, is expected to pay income tax on his income from investments—even on interests on savings deposits—in his own country; and the fact that his English enterprise is unprofitable cuts no figure in the matter. The same general principle of making him "pay the piper" who has the money to pay, holds good with aliens who die in England and leave their estate to some one who is a resident in that country. Notwithstanding the so-called free-trade system of England, it is a very expensive business for a wealthy foreigner to either live or die in that country. For the year 1907-8 the receipts from the "death duties" were £19,070,000 (about $95,000,000). Another source of income which falls mostly upon the property-owning class is that of the stamp and fee duties,—that is, the requirement that practically all legal

documents, all checks, all receipted bills over two pounds, etc., be stamped; and the receipts from these items amounted to nearly £9,000,000 (nearly $45,000,000) in 1907-8. Then there are other taxes which fall almost entirely upon the well-to-do and the comfortably-off middle classes:—the house duty and the land tax, which together in 1907-8 footed up the neat little sum of £2,690,000.

American State Socialism.

While the doctrines of Revolutionary Socialism are undoubtedly spreading with enormous rapidity among the proletariat of the world, State Socialism is progressing very fast among the governments of the most progressive nations, Municipal Socialism being included. In the United Kingdom the railroads are still privately owned, but there is a growing demand for their nationalization. While there seems to be little sentiment in America, outside the avowed Socialists, in favor of the government ownership of railroads, yet in other directions there has unquestionably been a recent letting-down of the bars of Individualism against State Socialism. While bitterly decrying Revolutionary Socialism, Mr. Roosevelt was, while President, very much of a State Socialist, of the Bismarckian order,—probably unconsciously. The recent Congressional and Executive action for the supervision of corporations, for the inspection of food products, and particularly the Act for the taxation of corporations, and the Resolution for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States so as to permit an income tax, are all to be properly classed as State Socialism.

The last national platform of the Republican Party

repudiated Socialism, yet it advocated postal savings banks—and they must be classed among State Socialist institutions. Replying to the protest of the American Bankers' Association against postal savings banks, the President of the United States, Mr. Taft, said in an address at the State Fair, Milwaukee, Wis., September 17, 1909:

> I am not a paternalist and I am not a Socialist, and I am not in favor of having the government do anything that private citizens can do as well, or better. But there are conditions.
>
> We have passed beyond the tide of what they call the "laissez faire school," which believed that the government ought to do nothing but run the police force, and we recognize the necessity for the interference of the government because it has great capital and great resources behind it, and because, sometimes, it can stand the lack of an immediate return on capital, to help out. We did it in our Pacific roads. We have done it in a great many different ways, and in this particular savings bank business, the government is especially fitted to do what no system of private bankers can do.

This reads like an extract from Bismarck's speech in the Reichstag defending his scheme of Imperial State Socialism!

Some political economists class the protective tariff itself as a piece of State Socialism; however this may be, there can be no doubt that the grants for the improvements of rivers and harbors, for irrigation, the use of national supplies for relief in great emergencies, and the Congressional distribution of seed to farmers, all come within the designation of State Socialism, although probably but few Americans think of them in that way. The proposed tax on corporations and personal incomes was denounced by some critics as being Socialistic,

and yet the same people never think of so designating present activities of the State which are undoubtedly Socialistic; the difference is that in the latter case people have got accustomed to the thing, while in the former case the novelty of the proposition presents it in a new and forbidding aspect.

Competent authorities differ very much as to the merits of State ownership of railroads as compared with private ownership. To an impartial student and observer there does not seem much to choose between the best of both systems—say between the railroads of America and England as examples of private ownership, and those of Germany as examples of government ownership. There can be no doubt, however, that in all progressive countries except the United States, the doctrine that the State should own and operate the railroads in the same way as it does the public highways, is becoming the generally accepted one; but it is acknowledged that Canada's experiment with the Inter-Colonial Railroad has not been a brilliant success. State ownership and control are now the general European rule. But no European country has gone so far as New Zealand in this respect, as in other phases of State Socialism. In that paradise of Paternalism, workmen are carried free under certain circumstances, and the railroads are used to further education: children for primary schools are carried free, and the older children are given rates which enable them to ride 120 miles for from three to six cents. In England some Socialists are demanding not only free rides on railroads, but free ocean trips! Presumably they will all want to go first-class and to travel on the largest and fastest vessels!

State ownership of railroads received a set-back by

the announcement in November, 1911, that the purchase and operation of the Western Railway of France by the Government had turned out disastrously, after an experiment of three years. The following remarkable statement is from the official organ of the Railway Workers' National Union:

> It is no secret to any one, not even to the minister of public works, that the advent of politics and politicians to the head of the system has brought about the lamentable condition with which it now struggles. There is not even an employee but believes, is convinced that with the present régime the system will be in a complete state of anarchy before two more years have gone.

American labor organizations have recently commenced to demand government old-age pensions. To a limited extent the situation is being met by the voluntary granting of pensions by some of the large private corporations, particularly the railroads. On January 1, 1911, the United States Steel Corporation inaugurated a system of classified pensions to its employees, ranging from $12 to $100 a month.

Municipal Socialism.

If Germany leads the world (next to New Zealand) in State Socialism, England occupies the premier place in Municipal Socialism, or Municipal Trading, as it is officially called; although, to be accurate, Municipal Socialism is really nothing but localized State Socialism. It is the extraordinary development of this form of State Socialism which has lately caused so much alarm in England. Even such a critic as Rae concedes that municipal ownership is the best of all forms of State

Socialism, for the reason that it is constantly exposed to the watchfulness of the tax-payers; but this consideration is negatived to a large extent by the notorious fact that as a rule it is those who pay the least taxes, individually and collectively, who are the loudest advocates of Municipal Socialism.

There are two kinds of Municipal Socialism—reproductive and unproductive enterprises. The former are those which bring in a revenue (or are supposed to do so), such as waterworks, gasworks, electric lighting, street railways (tramways), markets, etc. From a British Government report of 1903 it appears that all the municipal corporations of England and Wales, with the exception of 18 (299 out of 317), were carrying on one or more reproductive undertakings. The local Government Board Annual Report for 1906-7 shows that in 1902-3 there were 1,339 municipal, county, and urban district authorities engaged in trading enterprises, and that the British municipalities had a total indebtedness of nearly £371,000,000 (over $1,805,000,000); and that in 1904-5 the indebtedness was £466,500,000 (about $2,270,000,000)—an increase of £95,500,000 (about $465,000,000) in two years! In addition to the "public utilities," as generally accepted in both England and America, the British municipalities have gone into such enterprises as telephone services, golf links, manufacture of paving-stones, electric fittings, milk depots, steamboats, motor busses, bathing machines, fire and accident insurance, concert rooms, Turkish baths, concert halls, gas stoves, and transportation of goods. Agitation is now proceeding for the municipalization of coal, bread, and the sale of intoxicating liquors; and there is also a movement to follow French, German and

Belgium Socialism as to municipal pawn-shops. There was a semi-municipal steamboat service on the Clyde, which was a failure financially; and the steamboat service on the Thames, put in operation by the "Progressives" (really Fabian Socialists), not only was run at a working loss amounting to £130,000 (about $584,000) in three years, but it became a "laughing-stock," and it was definitely abandoned in 1908 after the anti-Socialists had swept the "Progressives" out of office in one of the most remarkable reversions of political popularity ever seen in England. In 1889-90 the annual local expenditures of the British municipalities were £67,000,000 (over $330,000,000); in 1904-5 they were £163,000,000 (nearly $800,000,000)—an advance of nearly one hundred millions sterling per annum in fifteen years! The English municipalities have very extensive home-rule powers under the Act of 1888, and the London County Council have almost the powers of a Continental principality. Still the Labor-Socialists are not satisfied, but are clamoring for more authority, and to be practically free from any supervision or restraining checks by a central authority, particularly as to the expenditure of money. This movement is being backed by all the subtle "permeation" tactics of the Fabians, who were from the first quick to realize that the road to Socialist national control was by and through the municipalities.

A Costly Experiment.

When criticism is made of the tremendous expense of the present rage for municipalization of almost everything, the British Socialists exclaim with fine contempt "———— the expense!" And they point to the "reproductive" enterprises as offsetting the indebtedness to

some extent. A close examination of the reports show, however, that only a very small amount is set aside for depreciation. For instance, the Government Return of 1903 shows that only £193,274 (a little over $940,000) is annually set aside for depreciation on over £121,000,000 (nearly $590,000,000), which is equal to only 3s. 2d. per cent.; and of this vast capital £103,000,000 are in water works, gas works, electricity supply, and trams (street railroads), undertakings which require a large amount to be set aside for depreciation. It so happened that the successful "permeation" of the municipalities with recklessly extravagant Socialism by the Fabians was contemporaneous with the period of the early development of the application of electricity as a motive power and for lighting purposes. Under the advancing threat of public ownership, the private tram companies and gas companies refrained from spending money to keep their plants up with the times; so that after the municipalities had taken over these properties they started with brand new rolling-stock and plants; and now the Socialists triumphantly point to the difference between the old and the new services as demonstrating the superiority of public over private ownership. But the youthfulness is rapidly being displaced by mature age in municipal enterprises; the rolling-stock and plants as a rule have not been kept up in proper repair, and they are rapidly depreciating. In the meantime, the British municipally-owned enterprises are not "keeping up with the procession," at least from an American standpoint; and in a quarter of a century—unless there be a great change in methods—the British municipalities will be owning a conglomeration of rolling-stock and plant which would have been sent to the "scrap-

heap" years before in America. It might be said that this is looking far ahead; just so; but even taking the British tramway enterprises at their best, when new, they do not compare more than fairly with the best of American privately-owned street railroad systems. A favorite method of comparison of advocates of municipal ownership is to compare one of these new and best of the British examples of municipal ownership with one of the worst in America of the privately owned—one operated under an old-style "graft" monopolistic charter, without proper preservation of the rights of the public and without the company having been required to pay for their valuable privilege. But with all the faults of American legislatures and American municipalities, it can be said that street railroad franchises granted now-a-days generally conserve the public and municipal rights. Furthermore, it can with confidence be asserted that there are privately-owned street car systems in America, operating under these carefully framed and honest franchises, which give far better and cheaper services than any of the best of the municipally-owned tram-way systems of Great Britain do, not excepting the much-vaunted systems of Liverpool and Glasgow. In an American city one can travel twice as far for five cents, or even on the basis of seven tickets for twenty-five cents, as can be travelled in a British municipally-owned tram for three pence (six cents); for the British system does not include "transfers;" and then, even on the "straight" fares it costs more to ride say three miles in England than it does the same distance in America. The only advantage the British system has is in short distances. But the American system has the overwhelming advantage in that it relieves

the congestion in the residence districts, and enables—and indeed induces—workingmen to live in the better air and surroundings of the country. This brings up another disadvantage of the British municipal system, as compared with the American privately-owned system—and that is as to "inter-urban" electric roads. In England the municipal cars stop, as a rule, at the municipal boundary, and it is a matter of much red-tape and of complicated arrangements for the tram system to be extended beyond the confines of the municipality; and when this is done, the expense to the passenger is at least twice as much as it is in America. In Great Britain, it must be said, the management is honest, and fairly efficient, but that is characteristic of British municipal life, not only in "trading" matters, but generally speaking. And, it is satisfactory to observe, conditions in this respect are improving in America.

The government of the Czar is not often associated with Socialism except as an autocracy always in battle array against the hosts of Democracy. But it seems that under a peculiar system in that unfortunate country, there is an extensive Municipal Socialism prevailing (although not known by that name officially), as there is Socialism in land ownership. A writer in the *Fortnightly Review* (London), January, 1903, says:

> . . . In Russia everything, from the bakery to the publishing trade, has been municipalized. The State is content with carrying on the transport of the Empire, working mines, mismanaging steel works, and selling vodka, but the local governments admit no limit to their enterprise at all. The "Duma" and the "Zemstvo" sell agricultural machinery, seed, horses, cattle, sewing machines, text-books, medicines, and magic lanterns; they manage theatres, deliver lectures, translate Milton and Molière, and expurgate Dostoyeffsky for the

benefit of the masses. While the City of London is wondering whether it will ever own its tramways, the City of Tiflis competes with the retail butchers, and sells sewing machines on the instalment system to impecunious sempstresses.

An American Consular report says that the government of St. Petersburg has started a municipal pharmacy, owing to the high price of medicines. The various disinfection and sanitary departments will be supplied, and to private persons drugs will be sold at 20% discount against the normal charges.

CHAPTER VII

CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

Christian Socialism is, in a special sense, the interpretation of Collectivism according to Christian principles; and, in a general sense is the application of Christianity to the entire range of Sociology. It would seem as though the term is a misnomer if strict Marxism be taken as the standard of Socialism; nevertheless, there are those who insist that true philosophic Scientific Socialism is compatible with Christian ethics, they pleading that the extreme views of Marx, Engels, Bebel, Bax, and others, are not necessarily a part of Modern Socialism. But it is incontrovertible that the majority of the recognized leaders of the Collectivist movement the world over decline to recognize so-called Christian Socialism except as an expression of discontent with existing economic and social conditions.

The Churches and Christian Socialism.

The Christian churches as organizations (with one notable exception—the Roman Catholic) have maintained a neutral attitude with regard to Scientific Socialism, although sometimes church conferences have given utterance to sentiments tinged with Socialism, and individual members of churches belong to Socialist organizations, both secular and religious, without denomina-

tional interference. What is sometimes spoken of as Catholic Christian Socialism is not the Modern Scientific Socialism; and the same may be said of several Protestant organizations.

Modern Christian Socialism as generally understood —that is, that which involves an acceptance of the principle of Collectivism—is a Protestant movement, not doctrinally, but in the sense that its activities, in an organized form, are practically confined to the Protestant denominations—especially in America and England. It is a singular fact, however, that Christian Socialism has had its greatest development in that communion which has been, in the minds of its critics, historically associated with caste and privilege—the Established Church of England. Likewise, in the United States, organized Christian Socialism has been mostly in that body which is the daughter of the Church of England, and still holds communion with her—the Protestant Episcopal Church, notwithstanding that this denomination is often slightingly referred to as the church of the wealthier classes. Another peculiar fact is that while the Roman Catholic hierarchy is as a rule absolutely opposed to Scientific Socialism, and while its special doctrines have been condemned by the Papacy (at least by implication), yet the school of theology in the Anglican Church which approximates the most closely to the Roman Catholic Church, is the one which is distinguished by the number of its priests who are avowed Socialists—the Ritualist or "High Church" party. For a period, Christian Socialism, as an organized force, was practically limited in England to members of the Anglican Church; but in recent years it has passed over that limitation; and now some of the most prominent

"Nonconformists" in England, and some of the leading lights in the "Evangelical" churches in America (both lay and clerical), are avowed Socialists, although probably most of them have certain reservations.

The Movement in England.

The rise of modern Christian Socialism may be said to date from the "Chartist" days of 1848—"that awful year," as Maurice once called it. The "Chartists" were those who demanded electoral reform as to the British Parliament. A monster petition was drawn up, said to have been signed by 5,000,000 persons [this was an exaggeration], which was to be presented to Parliament. The authorities feared trouble, and troops were placed under orders, they being commanded by the Duke of Wellington. Charles Kingsley, the famous author and preacher, was in sympathy with the movement, but he was extremely anxious to prevent bloodshed. So he wrote a placard addressed to the "Workmen of England," which was an eloquent and noble appeal to the good sense of the proletariat not to confound "liberty" with "license." Maurice and Kingsley were the founders of the modern Christian Socialist movement—at least in England and America.

The English Christian Socialists interested themselves in Co-operation, but their plan went further than did that of the "Rochdale Pioneers." The association of the Christian Socialists was composed of *producers,* of workmen who became their own employers, who distributed profits in proportion to the labor of each member of the society. In 1850 the first Christian Socialist Co-operative Society was formed. At a meeting of journeymen tailors it was resolved that "individual self-

ishness, as embodied in the competitive system, lies at the root of the evils under which English industry now suffers; that the remedy for the evils of competition lies in the brotherly and Christian principle of Co-operation —that is, of joint work, with shared or common profits; and that this principle might be widely and readily applied in the formation of Tailors' Working Associations." Afterwards there was formed the "Society for Promoting Workingmen's Associations," and in all, twelve of these industrial associations were formed. The movement was, however, a failure. There was a lack of "directive ability"—and then, there was a neglect to recognize modern conditions of Industrialism. This criticism of the experiment has been confirmed by subsequent experience, viz., that except in certain specialties of craftsmanship, Co-operation is of very doubtful success in industrial *production,* although there are many examples (particularly in England) of successful co-operative associations for *distribution.*

The most noted institution which has sprung from Christian Socialism is the Workingmen's College, of London, which originated from the Bible Class of Maurice and Kingsley. The Workingmen's College was opened in 1854, with Maurice as President, and it is still in existence, but it has not run altogether smoothly. Among the famous past teachers have been: Prof. J. R. Seeley, Frederic Harrison (the well-known Positivist), Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Ruskin, Huxley, and Tyndal. When Maurice died in 1870 he was succeeded as President by Thomas Hughes, the author of the immortal *Tom Brown's School-days.* In 1870 "Tom" Hughes visited the United States, and the "New Rugby" in Tennessee was formed, but it was not successful.

After the failure, in 1854, of the Christian Socialist co-operative experiments, the movement flowed in two separate streams for a time; one branch was identified with the Labor agitation, and the other was associated with theology. But afterwards these two currents joined in a new—and the latest—development of Christian Socialism in England, the Christian Social Union, which was formed in 1889, "for the study and advocacy of Christian social principles." There are branches in all the large cities of England. The principles are of such a broad nature that almost any Christian who believes that the present social system needs reformation, and that the application of Christian ethics is necessary for its reformation, is eligible for membership. It has affiliated societies in the United States, Australia and New Zealand. The Union is very influential in the Anglican communion.

In England there are a number of individual religious societies of differing degrees of Socialism, one of the most prominent being known as the Guild of St. Matthew, the special aim of which is to win back the workingmen to the churches. The Guild of St. Matthew has made some very radical pronouncements, and probably a large part of its membership are evolutionary Socialists in an economic sense, except that they believe in the interposition of Divine Providence in human affairs, which is practically denied by the genuine Marxists, or materialistic Scientific Socialists. Even in the days of Maurice and Kingsley it was very difficult to define Christian Socialism as compared with the purely secular Socialism of the orthodox followers of Marx and Engels, and that difficulty has increased.

The *Christian Socialist* (Chicago), of September 1, 1908, said:

> As a proof of how extensive and firmly Socialism is taking hold of the Church and becoming the hope of God's kingdom on earth, we cite the fact that among the many Socialist preachers of London are included the very chief preachers of the four principal denominations—Henry Scott Holland of the Church of England, canon of the world-famous St. Paul's Cathedral and editor of the *Commonwealth;* Rev. J. E. Rattenbury of the Wesleyan Church, pastor of the celebrated West London Mission, probably the greatest Methodist Church in London, where the noted Hugh Price Hughes preached for many years; Rev. R. J. Campbell, Congregationalist, editor of the *Christian Commonwealth,* the most prominent non-conformist preacher in England, who has made the pulpit of Joseph Parker at City Temple, London, still more famous, and Rev. John Clifford, whose name is honored by the Baptists all over the world. Than these four there are no names more honored in their respective denominations, yet they are all outspoken Socialists, declaring Socialism to be the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth.
>
> . . . In England the Church Socialist League, composed chiefly of priests and laymen of the High Church section of the Church of England, has enrolled hundreds of priests and is exerting a tremendous influence for Socialism.
>
> . . . Over two hundred American ministers in charge of various churches have signed their names to a manifesto issued by the General Secretary of the Christian Socialist Fellowship, pledging themselves to Socialism—the industrial and political revolution proclaimed by the constructive Socialists of all countries—as the political expression of the Kingdom of God as foretold in both the Old and New Testaments.

In March, 1909, there was formed at Swansea, Wales, the Free Church [Nonconformist] Socialist League, and seventy-three ministers immediately joined.

American Christian Socialism.

Christian Socialism in the United States must be considered apart from sectarian Utopian Socialism. It did not make its appearance in America, as an organized force, until some time after it had become established on the Continent and in England. For a while the movement lagged, but within recent years it has shown extension and virility. As in Europe, Christian Socialism is to a great extent very vague, some of its professors being opposed to orthodox constructive Scientific Socialism in certain of its phases. It may be said that on the part of all Christian Socialists in America, as in Europe, there is some difficulty experienced in apologizing for and explaining the starkly atheistic and grossly materialistic utterances of many leading representative Socialists, especially those of the early days on the Continent. The Chicago *Christian Socialist,* of March 1, 1909, in some comments on an address by the Right Reverend P. J. Donahue, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing Socialism on the ground of its alleged irreligion and immorality, says —and these comments may be accepted as a good summary of the general sentiments of Christian Socialists:

> No one more than ourselves deplores the fact that the earliest Socialist writers, stung to fiery resentment because the Catholic and Protestant churches of Europe were arrayed on the side of Mammon, flaunted their atheistic ideas before the world and thus raised the greatest barrier against Socialism, placed in our opposers' hands their deadliest weapon, and furnished them their most convenient subterfuge behind which to evade the real Socialist issue—the economic revolution. Socialism has the whole world at its feet studying economics. Our economic proposition is invincible. It is winning its way everywhere, and it will win

> in spite of the atheistic and free-love follies of certain Socialist writers; but on account of their folly we will have all the greater difficulty in winning our first national victories. . . . We are Socialists for economic, not theological reasons.

Socialism, in its Christian manifestation, was presented to the American people as early as 1849, when Henry James, Sr., in a lecture at Boston, made the claim that Socialism was identical with Christianity.

In 1872 a Christian Labor Union was organized.

In 1874-5 a paper called *Equity,* an exponent of Christian Socialism, was published in Boston.

On April 15, 1899, there was founded at Boston the Society of Christian Socialists, the Rev. Dr. Bliss, the editor of *The Encyclopedia of Social Reform,* being one of the promoters. This was the first organization of Christian Socialists in America, properly speaking, and it disbanded after a few years.

In 1891 there was established the Christian Social Union, on the basis of the English organization of that name. It was an organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and at the head of the movement were Bishop Huntington, the Rev. Dr. Holland, Prof. R. T. Ely, and Dr. Bliss. This organization has not grown, although it still exists; but there is another Episcopal Christian Socialist organization which has shown more vitality—the Church Association for the Advancement of the Interests of Labor, which is more radical than the Social Union, although its principles are not socialistic economically. It is a pioneer in seeking to settle industrial controversies by arbitration, and in the movement against "sweating."

The Baptists, in 1893, established the Brotherhood

of the Kingdom, an undenominational society. One of the leading ministers of the Baptist Church was until recently the pastor of the famous Fifth Avenue Church, New York, the Rev. Mr. Aked (now in California), who came from Liverpool, England, where he was considered rather an extreme Socialist for a minister of the Gospel. When Mr. Aked first came to America there was considerable curiosity expressed as to whether his environments as the minister in "Rockefeller's Church" (as it is called, from the fact that the multi-millionaire worships there) would have the effect of toning down his radicalism; but to the great satisfaction (and not a little to their surprise) of the Socialists, the reverend gentleman is still "sound and true."

The American Institute of Christian Sociology was organized in 1894 by Prof. R. T. Ely (of the University of Wisconsin), Prof. George Davis Herron (at that time holding the chair of Applied Christianity at Iowa College), and Prof. John Rogers Commons (of Wisconsin University). Prof. Ely was President of the Institute, Prof. Herron was Principal of Instruction, and Prof. Commons was Secretary; and they were a very able trio. Prof. Ely is one of the leading economists and reformers in America. He denies being a Socialist, but he is against monopolies, is in favor of the public ownership of "natural monopolies," and is a steadfast friend of the trade union movement. Prof. Commons holds views similar to those of Prof. Ely. When Prof. Herron was appointed to the chair of Applied Christianity at Iowa College, he was an intense Christian Socialist, but he grew more radical, and in 1900 he resigned his chair and renounced belief in Christianity as a distinctive religion. His old friends,

and religious circles generally, were shocked at his separation from his family, and at his socialistic wedding—or "annunciation," as it was called—to a young woman. Since then he has resided in Italy, and his connection with the Socialistic Party has been as a writer and lecturer.

The National Christian Socialist League (or Fellowship) was established at Louisville, Ky., in 1906, its object being thus stated:

> To permeate churches, denominations, and other religious institutions with the social message of Jesus; to show that Socialism is the necessary economic expression of the Christian life; to end the class struggle by establishing industrial democracy, and to hasten the reign of justice and brotherhood upon earth.

Continental Christian Socialism.

On the Continent there is a distinct cleavage between Christian Socialism and secular Socialism. So-called Christian Socialism itself, on the Continent, is divided into two camps—Roman Catholic and Protestant. The first is, necessarily, as an organization, controlled by the church; and also, necessarily, its aims are in harmony with the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, as expounded from time to time by the Vatican. Protestant Christian Socialism is naturally looser in organization and more indefinite and multiform in its objects. Speaking generally, both may be said to have similar aims—the application of Christian principles to social reformation. Both, also, are actuated by the desire to hold within its folds those of its adherents who are inclined to Socialism. The Scientific Socialists—or Social Democrats, to use a general term—are opposed

to both Roman Catholic and Protestant forms of Christian Socialism, and they either ignore them or actually oppose them.

In this respect there is a marked difference between Continental and British Socialism. In Great Britain the lines as to orthodox Scientific Socialism are not so sharply drawn as is the case on the Continent. There is more "fluidity," as it were. In Great Britain the word "Socialist" has a very indefinite meaning compared to what it has in Germany, France and Belgium. In Great Britain there are Scientific Socialists who are professors of orthodox Christianity; and there are members of Christian Socialist organizations who are in full sympathy and in active co-operation with the secular Labor-Socialist party. In that country there is a fading of one school of thought into another until the line of separation becomes almost imperceptible. To a certain extent there is the same characteristic in America; but there has not been the same development of Christian Socialism as in England.

It is to be observed, also, that, as yet, the Roman Catholic Church has not thought it necessary to utilize its tremendous social and organizing energies in England and America as it has on the Continent with the special view of counteracting secular Socialism; but within recent years there has been a tendency in this direction. So far as the popular vague conception of Socialism is concerned (which is not an accurate one), there is no special antagonism in England and America between it and the Roman Catholic Church; but there is no misapprehension on the part either of the intellectual leaders of Scientific Socialism or of the authorities of the Church; and each side understands that

there is an irreconcilable antagonism between them. The Roman Catholic Church draws a sharp line between Social Reform and Modern Socialism.

The great figure standing out in German Christian Socialism is Bishop Von Ketteler, who was born in 1811 and died in 1877. He was the founder of so-called Catholic Christian Socialism in Germany. He has been likened to Charles Kingsley, of England, and, like the latter, he strongly advocated industrial Co-operation. "May God in His goodness," said he, "bring all good Catholics to adopt this idea of co-operative associations of production upon the basis of Christianity." It should be said that Catholic authorities strenuously deny that Bishop Von Ketteler was a real Socialist. In 1868 there was organized the Christian Social Workingman's Association; and in 1870, the Catholic Journeymen's Club (organized in 1847) joined the Christian Socialist movement. These clubs are controlled by the Church, and are therefore opposed by the Marxist Socialists; they have grown very strong, and have been the political right arm of the Church in Germany.

The German Protestant Christian Socialist movement dates from 1838, a movement being then started by Victor Aimé, who shares with the good Bishop Von Ketteler the honor of being called the "father" of German Christian Socialism—only one was a Protestant while the other was a Roman Catholic. But the real Protestant Christian Socialist movement was begun in 1878 by Pastor Todt, whose efforts were ably backed up by the Court Chaplain, Dr. Stöcker. This movement is closely allied to Bismarckian State Socialism, and is really in defence of Church and State principles—something like the movement of the "Tory Democrats" of England.

The Social Democrats call the movement *mucker-Socialismus*—"sham Socialism." It is now nothing practically but a confederation of organizations for church and philanthropic work.

To be historically accurate, it should be said that France, and not England, is the birthplace of Christian Socialism. The first Socialist paper ever published was *Bouche de Fer* ("The Iron Tongue"). It was a Christian Communist paper, founded by Claude Fauchet, who in 1790 advocated a radical Christian Communism. There was Saint-Simon, who endeavored to found a new Christianity, in which Socialism should be a feature. Then there was Abbé de Lamennais, who, in 1830, founded the journal *L'Avenir,* with the motto, "God and Liberty, the Pope and the People." This paper was condemned by the Vatican, and Lamennais left the Church of Rome, but always advocated the alliance of religion and Socialism. After his break with the Papacy he published *Les Paroles d'un Croyant* ("The Words of a Believer"), which Dr. Bliss says "are among the noblest and most burning Christian Socialist utterances ever made." Cabet, the founder of Icarianism, held that Christianity is Communism.

In France, as in Germany, there is a distinctive Roman Catholic Christian Socialist movement. Soon after the Franco-German war the Comte de Mun and the Comte de la Tour-du-Pin Chambly founded an association for the purpose of applying Christianity to industrialism. This movement was bitterly hostile to Protestantism, holding it responsible for the misfortunes which had overtaken France; and as an antidote to Protestantism and economic Individualism it was intended to establish state-aided Co-operation under the patronage

of the Roman Catholic Church. As an economic success the movement has not been conspicuous, and the same may be said of the attempt to establish Protestant Christian Socialism in France.

In Belgium the Roman Catholic Church has many organizations for workingmen, and, as in Germany, they have been a tower of strength to the church. Prof. François Huet (born 1814) was the great Belgium Apostle of Christian Socialism. A follower, Prof. De Laveleye, says of Huet: "He was too full of Christianity for the Socialists, and too full of Socialism for the Christians." The same enthusiast makes this statement: "Every Christian who understands and earnestly accepts the teachings of His Master is at heart a Socialist; and every Socialist, whatever may be his hatred against all religion, bears within himself an unconscious Christianity." The same sentiments were recently expressed by an English Christian Socialist in an eulogy on a noted London Socialist who is an avowed atheist, and who himself contends that Socialism is incompatible with Christianity.

CHAPTER VIII

MARXIAN SOCIALISM

Now-a-days, when the word "Socialism" is used, that school known as Marxian is meant, unless there is a specification otherwise. As Prof. Thorstein Veblin says (*Quarterly Journal of Economics*): "No one is seriously apprehensive of any other so-called Socialistic movement, and no one is seriously concerned to criticise or refute the doctrines set forth by any other school of 'Socialists.'"

The Fundamentals.

While there is much difference among the exponents and critics as to the details of Marxian Socialism (called also Modern, Scientific, and Revolutionary), there is general agreement as to what constitute its fundamental bases as a system, viz.: (1) the doctrine of the "economic" or "materialistic conception of history;" and (2) the theory of "surplus value." Engels generously gives all the credit to his friend Marx for "these two great discoveries," with which, he claims, "Socialism became a science." Yet, what is now accepted in a general way as Marxian Socialism has been considerably modified within recent years; and there are important differences among even professed orthodox Scientific Socialists in regard to what were formerly consid-

ered essentials. In fact, there are now but few of the recognized intellectual leaders who hold the original Marxian faith in its fullness. Even Bebel, the leader of the German Socialists in the Reichstag, has admitted from his seat that his views have been both modified and developed, and that his party is "continually moulting." It is only the uninformed or hidebound fanatical Socialist who now looks upon Marx as the Pope of Economics. In 1848 Marx and Engels jointly issued the *Communist Manifesto*—a call to the workingmen of all nations to unite under the red banner of Socialism. [In that day Socialism as now understood was known by the name of Communism.] The *Communist Manifesto* contained a statement of the principles of Modern Socialism as elaborated afterward by Marx in his stupendous work, *Das Capital* (or *Capital*, as now generally given in America and England). In that historic document was stated the "fundamental proposition" or "nucleus" of Socialism; and Engels says that this "belongs to Marx." In an introduction to the *Manifesto* Engels thus presents Marx's "fundamental proposition":

> That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain

its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinction and class struggles.

In the opinion of Engels, this proposition was "destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology."

Marx's "Capital."

This evolutionary theory, as applied to labor and production, is what Socialists call the "economic" or "materialistic conception of history," and sometimes "economic determinism." In *Capital* Marx presents this theory most elaborately—and, as his admirers claim, to a mathematical demonstration; and, as a matter of fact, much of Marx's argument is in mathematical form. It may be said at the outset that most of the recognized political economists differ radically from Marx in his theory of Capital and Labor; but there is a general concession that in producing his marvellous work Marx has earned a leading place among economists. *Capital* is sometimes styled "the Bible of Socialism;" and some enthusiasts are extravagant in their attributes to Marx. For instance, Spargo (an English-American ex-minister), in *The Spiritual Significance of Modern Socialism,* speaks of "great men, such world-figures as Jesus, Savanarola, Luther, Lincoln, and Marx."

What is specifically known as Marxian Socialism is the system expounded primarily in the *Communist Manifesto* and afterwards elaborated in *Capital;* but the system also includes expositions by Marx in miscellaneous writings; and in a general way Marxian Socialism embraces propositions and views set forth by

such authorities as Engels, Liebknecht, Bebel, and Kautsky among the Germans; by Gronlund, Spargo, Hillquit, and Walling among American Socialists; and by Morris, Bax and Hyndman, among English Socialists. As a matter of fact, however, there is much difficulty in defining exactly what Marxian Socialism really is, largely because there is so much ambiguity and deep profundity in Marx's *Capital* itself. Primarily, this work is a criticism of modern Capitalism, and it is only indirectly an exposition of Socialism as a theory or system. Admittedly, there is no other production in the whole range of economic literature so difficult for even expert and informed students to fully comprehend as *Capital;* and to the average reader much of it is as puzzling as a problem in algebra. Furthermore, the entire work of *Capital* has not been available to the vast majority of even the most enthusiastic admirers of Marx—at least, in America and England.

Marx died in 1883. Up to that time only one volume of *Capital* had been published (it being in German), and the first edition of that volume to appear in English was in 1886, it being a translation of the third German edition as a basis—that edition having been prepared the year Marx died, with the assistance of notes left by the author. The first English edition of the first volume was edited by Engels, the translation being by an old English friend of Marx and Engels, with the assistance of Marx's daughter and her husband, Dr. Aveling, who became one of the leading Socialists in Europe. Marx had planned a translation of the first valume in 1876 in America, but the project was abandoned chiefly because of the lack of a fit translator. When Marx died he left his unpublished notes to Engels, who issued in German

the second and third volumes; then he died, in London, as had Marx; and the two greatest of all Modern Socialists, literary partners and the warmest of friends, lie buried in that city. Until quite recently, only the first two volumes have been available in English; but the third volume has recently been published in that language, it being part of an American publication edited by a well-known admirer of Marx and Engels, Ernest Untermann. In his preface that gentleman declares that "as a matter of fact, a large portion of the contents of *Capital* is as much a creation of Engels as though he had written it independently of Marx." But even the third volume does not exhaust the "raw material" left in the form of rough notes by Marx to his literary executor, Engels. Mr. Untermann says that some years previous to Engel's death, and in anticipation of such an eventuality, the latter had appointed Karl Kautsky, the editor of *Die Neue Zeit*, the scientific organ of the German Socialist Party, as his successor, and familiarized him personally with the subject matter intended for volume IV of *Capital*. The material proved to be so voluminous, that Kautsky, instead of making a fourth volume of *Capital* out of it, abandoned the original plan and issued his elaboration as a separate work in three volumes under the title of *Theories of Surplus Value*. It is announced that an English translation of Kautsky's compilation of the posthumous notes of Marx and Engels will appear in due time. So, up to the present time, only three volumes of *Capital* are available in the English language; and there are three additional volumes of the same stupendous work, but under another name, which, as yet, have not been translated into English.

Prof. LeRossignol argues in *Orthodox Socialism* that "the Marxian view of history should be called psychological rather than materialistic, for it is based upon a study of the motives which actuate human conduct;" and although the Professor is a severe critic of Modern Socialism, he concedes that Marx's economic interpretation of history "is a scientific conception, and in so far as it is a part of Socialism, Socialism is scientific." On the other hand, Dr. Bliss, who is an avowed but a moderate Socialist, says, in his *Handbook of Socialism:*

> Marxian Socialism has been technically called "Scientific Socialism," but to-day by no means all scientific Socialists accept its analysis. Many of them, particularly in England, reject Marxian economics, even in the same breath that they acknowledge the service rendered to mankind by Marx, and even while they enthusiastically support the Marxian Socialist policy. Marx was not the founder of a new economic system. He simply took the economic basis he inherited from Adam Smith and Ricardo, and carried it out with wide learning, masterly analysis, and acutest logic into Socialism. But it may be carried still further to Anarchism. If labor is the source of value, Anarchism is logical, though impracticable. But the trouble was with what Marx inherited. Most political economists to-day and a growing number of Socialists reject his inherited fundamental basis that labor is the source and measure of [exchange] value. They are coming to hold rather with Jevons, that utility, rightly conceived, is the source of [exchange] value. Rejecting the basis, they therefore reject the Marxian analysis and come to his result from another standpoint. All modern production they declare to be a social process, to which land, capital and labor must *all* contribute. If any persons monopolize any of these elements, all other persons are necessarily at their service. Therefore they would have society, as a whole, own both land and capital and perform labor.

The Marxian Theory of Values.

"The key to Marx's economic doctrines," declares Prof. Ely, "is his theory of value;" and yet, as can be seen from the above quotation from Dr. Bliss, there is not an acceptance of this theory by all Socialists. Indeed, there is much confusion and difference among both Socialist and anti-Socialist authorities, in presenting in specific formula exactly what Marx's theory is—and particularly what it is in relation to Labor. The theory is admitted by informed admirers of Marx not to be original with him, but is conceded to be an amplification and scientific systemization of theories advanced by Rodbertus and Ricardo and others. Although Prof. Ely disclaims being a Socialist, yet the followers of Marx accept him as an impartial expounder of their doctrines; and the following outline by him in *French and German Socialism* of the Marxian theory of values may be taken as one of the best succinct statements of this complicated principle of Socialism which has ever been made:

> He [Marx] begins by separating value in use from value in exchange. Value in use is utility, arising from the adaptation of an article to satisfy some human need. Air, water, sunshine, wheat, potatoes, gold, and diamonds are examples. It does not necessarily imply exchange value. Many goods are very useful but not exchangeable, because they are free to all. Such is the case, usually, with water. On the other hand, no goods can have value in exchange unless it is useful. Men will not give something for that which satisfies no want or need. Both value in use and value in exchange are utilities, but, as they differ, there must be some element in the one which the other does not *per se* contain. We find what that is by analyzing the constituent elements of different goods which possess exchange value. How can we compare them? Only because they contain

some common element. . . . The common element is found alone in human labor. You compare labor with labor. . . . Labor-time is the measure which we apply to different commodities in order to compare them. We mean thereby the ordinary average labor which is required at a given time in a given society. The average man is taken as a basis, together with the average advantages of machinery and the arts. This is average social labor-time. Complicated labor is simply a multiple of simple labor. One man's labor, which has required long and careful training, may count for twice as much as ordinary, simple labor; but the simple labor is the unit.

Spargo (who often complains that critics misrepresent Marx) thus states the theory (*Socialism*):

. . . To state the Marxian theory accurately, we must qualify the bald statement that the exchange value of commodities is determined by the amount of labor embodied in them, and state it in the following manner: *The exchange value of commodities is determined by the amount of average labor at the time socially necessary for their production.* This is determined, not absolutely in individual cases, but approximately in general, by the bargaining and higgling of the market, to adopt Adam Smith's well-known phrase.

The best-known Marxian authority in America, Hillquit, thus summarizes the fundamental principle of Modern Socialism (*Socialism in Theory and Practice*):

The principal wealth of modern society is represented by an accumulation of commodities owned by individual competing capitalists and used for the purpose of exchange. The process of modern industry is a process of manufacture and exchange of such commodities. All wealth is created in that process, and all profits are derived through it. The different commodities exchange for each other at their actual value; hence, the accumulation of profit and wealth must not be

> looked for in the process of exchange, but in the process of production.
>
> The value of a commodity is determined by the average social labor expended on its production, and if the manufacturing capitalist should pay to the laborer a wage equivalent to the products of his labor, there would remain no margin of profit for him, and the hoarding up of individual wealth would be impossible.

Dr. Bliss is one of the many educated Socialists who repudiates Marx's theory of values, as generally interpreted by both his followers and critics, his view being: "Labor does not measure value. A bushel of grain carefully and laboriously raised on a desert island sells for no more than a bushel of grain raised in Kent or Kansas. Utility, rightly understood, is the measure of value."

So great is the difference among Socialists upon this point, and so effective has been the criticism of anti-Socialists upon the prevailing understanding of Marx's theory, that some of the defenders of the "Master" are driven to the worn-out expedient of declaring that he has been misrepresented—that Marx never intended to convey the impression that labor is the source of all value. The most plausible of all Marx's apologists, Spargo, admits that at the famous Convention at Gotha, in 1875, the German Social Democracy (which has always been of the accepted Marxian school) declared in their programme that "labor is the source of all wealth and culture;" but Spargo exultantly points out that Marx protested and claimed that nature should be included. Nevertheless, it is a fact that this declaration was allowed to remain in the programme of the German Social Democracy for many years; and it has

been in the platform of many other Socialist organizations. It is now too late in the day to deny that the general view among the rank and file of Marxian Socialists, and also of many (if not most) of their intellectual leaders was—and is now—that *all* value to commodities is given thereto by labor—"average" labor, if you will, but by labor exclusively; and, indeed, many of them claim that this value attaches only to *manual* labor. One of the most learned and fairest-minded of avowed Socialists living is Thomas Kirkup, the author of the noted article on Socialism in the *Encyclopedia Britannica.* In his *History of Socialism* (edition of 1906) he says: ". . . It is obvious, however, that the definition of labor assumed both in Ricardo and Marx is too narrow. The labor they broadly posit as the source of wealth is manual labor." Socialist literature—especially that intended for the consumption of the workingmen—teems with the assertion that manual labor is to be credited with the production of all the wealth of the world; and it is not unfair to say that Marx himself is responsible for this most extraordinary kind of economic doctrine, it being the only logical conclusion of his teachings and of the general argument of his theory so ponderously and voluminously set forth in *Capital,* and still earlier in his *Communist Manifesto.* The German Socialists had imbibed their Socialist ideas from these two works years before they formulated the Gotha programme. The *Manifesto* was first published in 1848; the first German edition of *Capital* (the first volume—the only one issued by Marx himself) came out in 1867; and the Gotha programme was not adopted until eight years afterwards. The question arises: Had not Marx modified his views in the meantime? It cer-

tainly looks that way. Through what is known as the Bernstein controversy, in regard to the ever-increasing concentration of wealth and production, much doubt had arisen among the German Social Democracy as to the soundness of the Marxian philosophy; and in an account of this dispute Prof. Rae makes the following interesting observations in the new edition (1908) of *Contemporary Socialism:*

> Now while things have thus been going hard with the theory of social revolution by historical necessity, which constitutes one-half of the Socialism that likes to call itself scientific, it is curious that the Marxian theory of value which constitutes the other half of it has been found to have been thrown overboard by Marx himself. It was only meet that the master should suffer his bit of "intellectual moulting" as well as the disciples. In the third volume of his work on capital [that is, the third volume of *Capital*] which was published by his friend Engels, in 1894, he has been obliged to admit that the theory in question, which represents value to be the product of labor alone, to be indeed nothing but the quantity of labor communicated to the commodity and preserved in it, is not really true of value as value is actually constituted in this world.

"Surplus Value."

Now we are getting into "the heart of things" in the Marxian system of Socialism.

The modern concept of Socialism centres around two ideas: (1) "surplus value," and (2) "Collectivism." The first idea conveys the insistence that the wage-earner is robbed of what rightfully belongs to him—a certain product of his labor which belongs to him and to him alone, and of which he is robbed under the present capitalistic system by his employer; and the second idea is that this robbery can only be ended, and that

the worker can only receive the full product of his labor, by the communal ownership and control of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. Marx claims that Capitalism is founded on the appropriation of the surplus value of the product of the wage-earner —that the capitalist gets rich by this exploitation of the worker.

In his first volume of *Capital* Marx thus sets out his theory of surplus value:

> In every kind of merchandise, also in labor capacity, there is a distinction between use-value and exchange-value. The exchange-value of labor capacity is determined by the average quantity of labor it represents, or by the price of victuals ordinarily required for its sustenance. In labor capacity there is, however, also a certain use-value, a gift of nature, without cost to the laborer, but very remunerative for the capitalist.
>
> The value [exchange value] of labor capacity is therefore quite a different thing from its exploitation in actual work [its use-value].
>
> This difference in values is the object which the capitalist has in view when purchasing "labor capacity." The capitalist pays merely for the exchange-value of labor capacity, but what he aims at obtaining is its specific use-value, namely, its power of producing values exceeding its own. For this specific purpose it is employed by the capitalist, who acts therein according to the immutable laws of exchange. In fact, the seller of labor, as of any other commodity, realizes no more than its exchange-value—i. e., he is paid for the exchange-value only of his labor, and yet surrenders its entire use-value to the purchasing capitalist. He cannot receive the price for the former without surrendering the latter. The use-value of his labor, namely, the work actually done, belongs to the seller no more than the use-value of oil sold belongs to the oil-dealer. The capitalist pays for the daily value of labor capacity and then claims the use of it during the entire day, or the work of a whole day.

Briefly, and in simple form, the theory of Marx is this: The worker can, under normal conditions, produce a value equal to the wages paid to him (which wages are only sufficient for his subsistence) in about half the time he labors:—that is, if he works, say, ten hours he earns enough in five to sustain him, and, as a matter of fact, he is only paid for five hours' work; then there are five hours of the daily labor which create surplus value, and this the capitalist appropriates. Shäffle puts it this way: "The worker receives in wages (according to the actual doctrine of the liberal political economists) on an average *not* the full productive value of his day's work, but very much less—in fact, only what will bring him the absolute necessaries of life. He works ten or twelve hours, while perhaps his wage is produced in six. Whatever he may produce beyond his necessaries of life (the so-called surplus-value) the capitalist pockets. The surplus-value is absorbed in daily driblets by the great sponge of capital, becomes the profits of the capitalist, and eventually an accumulation of capital. . . . So there goes on, under the mask of a wage-system, the daily and hourly exploitation of the wage-earners, and capital becomes a vampire, a money-grubber, and a thief." Says Marx: "This increment or excess over the original value I call surplus-value." Commerce, he also says, "is generally cheating."

Capitalism.

It is a favorite saying of Socialists that they do not desire to destroy capital, but *Capitalism*. Marx conceives capital as "the means of exploitation" of labor. A brief definition of capital by Alfred Marshall is, "that

part of wealth which is devoted to obtaining further wealth." In their *Manifesto* Marx and Engels say: "To be a capitalist, is to have not only a purely personal, but a social status in production. Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion." Then Marx and Engels explain what is meant by Socialists when they say that they do not seek to destroy the *thing* capital, but only to change its social relation, under Collectivism: "When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, into the property of all members of society, personal property is not thereby transformed into social property. It is only the social character of the property that is changed. It loses its class-character." Under the present system, according to the Marxian theory, capital is increased by the following methods: (1) By multiplying the number of workmen; (2) by lengthening the working hours; (3) by shortening the time in which the laborer must work to produce what is necessary for his maintenance (which according to Marx's theory fixes his wages), this shortening of time being attained by improved methods and faster and more efficient machinery. And this brings Marx to the following conclusion: The greater the extent to which machines are employed and the more methods are improved—thus increasing the productivity of labor—the lower wages fall and the greater the profits of the capitalist becomes.

One of the most noted of the *Fabian Essays* is "The Industrial Basis of Socialism," by William Clarke. This essay describes how the capitalist was originally a business manager, who received what is called "wages of

superintendence," for which he performed real functions; but now the capitalist employs a salaried manager, and he himself has become a mere rent or interest receiver, he being paid for the use of a monopoly which not he but the whole people created by their joint efforts; and to prevent the cutting of profits capital is "massed" by joint-stock companies, goods are produced by machinery, and individual industrialism is crushed out. And then the essayist proceeds to say:

> The manager's business is to earn for his employers the largest dividends possible; if he does not do so, he is dismissed. The old personal relation between the workers and the employer is gone; instead thereof remains merely the cash nexus. To secure high dividends, the manager will lower wages. If that is resisted there will probably be either a strike or lockout. Cheap labor will be, perhaps, imported by the manager; and if the work people resist by intimidation or organized boycotting, the forces of the State (which they help to maintain) will be used against them. In the majority of cases they must submit. Such is a not unfair picture of the relation of capitalist to workman to-day, the former having become an idle dividend receiver.

Collectivism.

What is the remedy for this condition of affairs? Modern Socialists claim that there is only one remedy —Collectivism, that is, the public (not the State, as now constituted) ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange. Modern Socialists put aside Paternal or State Socialism, Utopian Socialism (or voluntary communistic organizations), and Trade Unionism, profit-sharing, Co-operation, land nationalization, a reformed system of taxation, etc.: all these, they say, are all right in their way,

but at the best are merely palliative and tentative; they claim that there can be no real solution of the labor problem until the ax is laid at the root of the upas-tree of Capitalism—until private capital is abolished, and capital is owned and operated by the community for the general benefit of all.

How will Collectivism be brought about? It should ever be kept in mind that according to the Marxian theory this change from the private to the public ownership and control of capital is to come not by the mere will of humanity, but by the evolutionary process of economic conditions, and that this process is even now and indeed fast developing to fruition; although there is wide difference of views as to when the Co-operative Commonwealth will be established, and as to how the change will come about. But most Socialists profess an absolute faith in the inevitableness of the transformation; to them it is as irresistible as fate itself; it will come because it *must* come, and not necessarily because it *ought* to come. They concede that legislative and State action can oil the wheels of the machine, can make it run easier, and might hasten the day of Jubilee; but they claim that all the parliaments of the world combined, and all the Czars and Bismarcks that may yet arise to dominate the autocracies and bureaucracies of the world, cannot prevent the coming triumph of Socialism.

The "Industrial Revolution."

Capitalism as a system, in the modern understanding of the term, took on definite shape as an outcome of what Socialists call the "industrial revolution." According to the Marxian argument, this "industrial revo-

lution" brought about the necessity for Socialism. There is no controversy as to the fact of the "industrial revolution." It occurred at the close of the eighteenth century, and was caused by the introduction of machinery and the "socialization" of industries, as it is called—that is, by the organization of industry, the establishment of factories, and the division of labor, instead of the workman, as formerly, producing commodities individually, completing an article from start to finish. This "industrial revolution" swept manufactures into the hands of the capitalist class, and the individual, independent workman, owning his own means of production, disappeared. There had been capitalism of another kind before—that is, there had been systems of accumulation of wealth, some of which had been used for the production of other wealth. Marx denied that the secret of primitive accumulation was thrift and diligence as against extravagance and laziness. "The truth is," he says, "that historically everything is conquest, brutality, robbery—in a word, force. Primitive accumulation is the separation by force of the producer from the means of production." The wage-laborer is an evolution of economic society. There was in turn: the ancient slave; the serf; the guild-worker; the individual, independent worker, owning his own means of production; and lastly, there is the wage-earner, whose only asset is his "labor-power," and who has to sell that to the capitalist for the bare means of subsistence, while at the same time he has to turn over to the capitalist for nothing the "surplus value" above and beyond his subsistence. As to the industrial capitalist, Marx says that he, on his part, had (1) to fight the feudal lord; (2) to fight the guilds; (3) to rob the laborer of the means

of production. The transformation of feudal exploitation into capitalistic exploitation began, here and there, in certain of the Mediterranean towns, as early as the fourteenth or fifteenth century; but formally, the capitalistic era dates from the sixteenth century. When feudalism disappeared, the bulk of the population were free peasant-proprietors; and what wage-earners there were generally owned a little land and their cottage, and fed their stock on the common land, from which, also, they took the wood they needed for fuel. Then in the latter end of the fifteenth century and the commencement of the sixteenth the feudal lords drove the peasants from their possessions and stole the common lands, and the dispossessed and wandering ex-retainers and ex-peasant-proprietors were the first proletarians. By the end of the eighteenth century the independent yeomanry had vanished, and by 1800 the last trace of the common land of the agricultural laborer was gone. Marx says that the English oligarchy of to-day was founded on the spoliation of the Church and the theft of the State lands from the peasantry. In tracing the development of the "capitalist farmer," Marx observes: "The lion's share always falls to the middleman. Examples—financiers, merchants, shopkeepers, lawyers, M. P.'s, priests." When the factory system came, there came a new social order: on the one side Capitalism; on the other side Proletarianism. Socialists claim that the proletarians, the wage-earners, are really economic slaves. Now: "Self-earned private property, that is based, so to say, on the fusing together of the isolated, independent laboring individual with the conditions of his labor, is supplanted by capitalistic private property,

which rests on the exploitation of the nominally free labor of others, *i. e.*, on wages-labor."

But there is still a further evolutionary development of the economic relations between Capital and Labor in the assumed inevitable march to Collectivism. The large capitalists begin to attack the smaller: "One capitalist always kills many." Parallel with the relative ever-diminishing number of small, individual capitalists—as claimed by the Marxists—and with the increase of the strength of the capitalism of the remaining monopolists, trusts, and combines, there is "a growing mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this, too, grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized, by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself." Referring to the gobbling up of the small and individual capitalists by the large and combined capitalists, Marx exclaims with exultant sarcasm, "The knell of capitalist property sounds. *The expropriators are expropriated!* The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property." Marx argues, and present-day Socialists boast, that the formation of the vast commercial combines and industrial trusts are not an obstacle but almost a condition-precedent for the introduction of Socialism. Says Marx: "The transformation of scattered private property, arising from individual labor, into capitalist private property, is, naturally, a process incomparably more protracted, violent, and difficult, than the transformation of capitalistic private property, already practically resting on socialized production, into

socialized property. In the former cases we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people." Stripped of verbiage, Marx means by this that the establishment of Socialism will be easier than was the establishment of the present system of Capitalism.

How Will Collectivism be Established?

After diligently and laboriously groping his way through the ponderosities of Marxian Socialism to the stage where it is mathematically demonstrated that Capitalism *must* collapse and Collectivism *must* come as an irresistible economic evolution, the faithful student at last reaches "the jumping-off place." According to that most delightfully inconsistent of all Socialist writers, H. G. Wells, Socialism is exchanging "New Worlds for Old." But how is the exchange to come about? Behind him, the student sees the bleak, cruel desert of Capitalism; in front of him lies the fruitful, joyous garden of Socialism. How is the weary traveller to cross the intervening yawning chasm, the dividing torrent? Is he to reach the promised land by being borne over by a catastrophic upheaval, by one Titanic propulsive explosion of the forces of nature? Or, is he, slowly and laboriously, with much halting and many set-backs, to struggle onward, ploddingly, progressing step by step across the valley of tribulation and despair; and then, when out of the depths, to make the ascent to the other side, climbing upwards literally inch by inch, digging his bleeding hands and feet into the precipitous and rocky ledges, until he finally reaches the top, and then to pass, exhausted, but triumphant,

through the golden shining gateway into the Paradise of the world's toilers—Collectivism?

One can search the whole range of Modern Socialist literature without finding an adequate answer. To ask the question is foolishness; to attempt to answer it is still greater foolishness: Such is the Modern Socialist position. Confessedly, nobody of authority pretends to be able to give a satisfactory answer. But there are Socialists who, while they will not undertake to lay down a programme, will go so far as to suggest how Collectivism *may* be brought about. If objections are made thereto, then these Socialists calmly say, as if the subject is not of much importance, anyhow, "Very well, we won't discuss the matter. We'll concede all you say, if you like; all we know is that in *some* way Collectivism will be brought about!" The great trouble is, they say, that nobody who is not a Marxian Socialist understands Marxian Socialism! And without a trace of sarcasm it might be remarked that those who are so gifted with intelligence as to be able to understand Marxian Socialism, understand it in so many different ways as to be quite confusing to ordinary mortals. Of all the American expounders of Marxian Socialism, from a professedly Marxian standpoint, the most pretentious exponent—and the adjective is not used in an offensive sense—is Ernest Untermann, the editor of the new American edition of the three first volumes of *Capital*. He complains that "the professors of the ruling class have never been able to distinguish between a scheme and a historical process." That is the old complaint of the Marxians. They set aside Utopian Socialism and State Socialism as "mere schemes," and they speak of Marxian Socialism as "a historical development." Still,

even Mr. Untermann recognizes the requirement of saying something about the manner of the transformation from Individualism to Collectivism; and this is his explanation (*Marxian Economics*):

> The antagonism between exploiters and exploited becomes more and more intense. It is transferred from the economic to the political field. Organized by the requirements of capitalist production itself, the proletariat adapts its economic organizations to the form of modern centralized industries, transforms its craft unions into industrial unions, unites its economic and political organizations in a well-planned division of labor, conquers the political power, and enables its economic organizations to take hold of the great sources of production and distribution in the interest of the working class, which remains the sole essential class in society.
>
> As soon as the working class controls the nation economically and politically, it inaugurates a system of collective production, in which the producers control their means of life, determine their own share in the co-operatively produced articles, and remove all obstacles to a full human development. Capitalism leaves the field to Socialism.

There is unanimity among all schools of Socialists that the first thing for the proletariat to do is to "seize the political power;" and then, in the language of Liebknecht, "Down with the wage system!" Listen to the "Masters," Marx and Engels themselves, in their *Manifesto:* . . . "The first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy. The proletariat will use its political supremacy, to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to concentrate all instruments of production in the hands of the State, *i. e.*, of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and

to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible."

Hillquit argues that in the general scheme of Socialism, the modern State has the very important mission of paving the way for the transition from private to collective ownership; but he confesses—and here he differs from most Marxians—that the transformation will be by no means a simple task.

The same writer touches upon a phase of this question which is generally avoided by cautious "Intellectual" Socialists—that of compensation for private property turned into public ownership. It is very significant, however, that in much of the current Socialist literature intended for the consumption of the working class, the doctrine of confiscation is boldly preached. Hillquit observes that the "Socialist programme" is silent upon this point, although he claims that "the greater number of Socialist writers incline towards compensation;" but he adds that in this they merely express their individual present preferences. He draws attention to the fact that the French clergy were not compensated for the lands taken from them by the bourgeoisie revolution, and that the Russian noblemen and the American owners were not paid upon the emancipation of their serfs and slaves. It is evident that Hillquit is not shocked by the possibility of confiscation under Socialism.

Dr. Schäffle (*Quintessence of Socialism*) explains that Socialism would probably take over private industries one after another, and organize them upon a public basis, and that "it might begin by taking only those branches of industry which are already carried on on a large scale, and consolidating them into uniform pro-

ductive public bodies under State regulation and inspection."

Notwithstanding that Morris and Bax are strongly Marxian, they declare that the "catastrophic" theory of the collapse of private capitalistic ownership and the sudden transformation of industries into Collective property, is a "ridiculous assumption;" and they suggest that there should be the acquirement by municipalities and trade organizations of the industries of the country. This has not only been the theory but has been the principle of action of both the English (Fabian) and the French Socialists; and Enrico Ferri, a leader of the Italian Socialists, urges that the conquest of political power by the Socialists must primarily come through the municipalities. (*Socialism and Positive Science.*)

Spargo confesses that "omniscience would be necessary" to tell how Socialism would be established; and in this connection he gives the following personal reminiscence in *Socialism:*

> Those who are familiar with the writings of Marx know that, in strange contrast with the fundamental principles of that theory of social evolution which he so well developed, he lapsed at times into the Utopian habit of predicting the sudden transformation of society. Capitalism was to end in a great final "catastrophe" and the new order be born in the travail of a "social revolution." I remember that when I joined the Socialist movement, many years ago, the Social Revolution was a very real event, inevitable and nigh at hand, to most of us. The more enthusiastic of us dreamed of it; we sang songs in the spirit of the *Chansons Revolutionaires,* one of which, as I recall, told plainly enough what we would do—
>
> "When the Revolution comes."
>
> Some comrades actually wanted to have military drill at our business meetings, merely that we might be ready for

> the Revolution, which might occur any Monday morning or Friday afternoon. If this seems strange and comic as I relate it to-day, please remember that we were very few and very young, and, therefore, very sure that we were to redeem the world. We lived in a state of revolutionary ecstasy. Some of us, I think, must have gone regularly to sleep in the mental state of Tennyson's May Queen, with words equivalent to her childish admonition—
>
> "If you're waking call me early,"
>
> so fearful were we that the Revolution might start without us!

Here again, Socialism sings two songs—one to the "intellectuals," and the other to the proletariat: for, most certainly the old Marxian theory still holds its sway in most popular presentations of Socialism. The same is true as to compensation and confiscation:—the learned text-books attempt to smooth matters over by saying that in democratically-governed countries in which Socialism will be established without a revolution, there will probably be compensation for property taken over; but in speeches and newspapers and cheap publications intended for working men, confiscation is not only suggested but is often boldly defended.

The Co-operative Commonwealth.

Necessarily, the organization and administration of the Co-operative Commonwealth would depend largely upon the extent to which the principle of Collectivism would be applied. Here again we are confronted by a great divergence among Socialists. Among their leading writers of the present day the prevailing opinion seems to be that quite apart from mere personal belongings, it would not be practical for the State to own and control *all* the means of production. There is, how-

ever, a general agreement that the following should be included within public socialization: (1) All natural resources—land, mines, forests, water-ways, oil wells, etc.; (2) means of public transportation—railroads, canals, street cars, etc.; (3) means of communication—telegraphs, telephones, and wireless telegraphy; (4) all "Socialized" industrial operations, particularly those involving large capital, and even more especially those which are in their nature monopolies, or which have come under the control of trusts and combinations; (5) all such other works and functions as are now under public ownership and control.

In regard to the abstract principle of Collectivism, that in itself is a comparatively simple matter. It is in the application of that principle, and the administration of the consequent organized system, that the greatest difficulties arise, even when treated theoretically. Many Socialist authorities loftily brush aside all questions relating even to the possible framework of the organization and administration of the Co-operative Commonwealth; and some of them ignore the question of details but undertake to outline the form which the Socialist State may likely take. When anti-Socialist objections are raised, then the always-ready answer is made that Socialism is a principle and not a scheme. With regard to the principle of Collectivism itself, there has been, at any rate, a certain standard, and, indeed, creed, with Marx as the authority and prophet. But, having bequeathed to his followers the Socialist State, Marx leaves them to their own devices. Modern Socialism disdains Utopianism—it is contrary to its very genius to idealize about anything; it simply provides for overturning the existing political, social, and economic

systems, and securing possession of all productive capital; and the rest is in the womb of the future. In their *Manifesto,* Marx and Engels proclaim that the Socialists "openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions." The two most prominent leaders of German Social Democracy say the same thing, Liebknecht declaring that they demand "a radical abolition of the present social order," and Bebel announcing that they intend to "make a clean sweep."

Socialism as Affecting Religion and the Family.

Here arises a fundamental difference between two distinct schools of Marxian Socialists, not to speak of those Socialists who decline to be so labelled. One school hold that the application of Marxian principles will have only economic effects. They confine the "materialistic conception of history" and the interpretation of the forces making for Socialism purely to "the bread and butter" problem; they limit the principles of Socialism and Collectivism altogether to material things; to them Socialism means that instead of private property there will be public property—that instead of wages there will be "an equitable apportionment" to every worker of the products of his labor, or a distribution of the general product according to his individual needs—and to them Socialism means nothing more, except, of course, a democratic form of government. It is fair to say that this is the publicly-declared attitude of most of the organized Political Socialist parties throughout the world within recent years; but it is not unfair also to say that the organized Socialists have been driven into this position by reason of the attacks

which have been made upon them on the ground that the adoption or the coming into being of Socialism would mean the complete overthrow of the present social state as affecting religion, the family, and particularly the marriage relation. The exact point at issue is often misunderstood by critics of Socialism. There have been Socialists who have cried "Down with religion!" or "Abolish the family!" or "Let's have free love!" There may be such who demanded these things from sheer perversity or depravity of nature; but such men, it is proper to say, form an infinitesimal minority even among "extreme" Socialists. The question really resolves itself into that of the inherent and inevitable all-embracive evolutionary principle of Socialism as defined by Marx and Engels.

There are a large number of Socialists—the second school of Marxians referred to—who extend the principle or doctrine of the "materialistic conception of history" into every relation of life, social, ethical and religious, as well as economic and political. And it cannot be denied that these latter interpreters of Marxism have included the great majority of the recognized intellectual leaders of the movement. They ridicule the idea that the spirit and philosophy of Socialism are to be confined solely to the matter of the production of goods and the apportionment of the products of Labor. To them Socialism means vastly more than a wholesale co-operative scheme; they believe that Socialism is all-inclusively Sociological, and not exclusively Economic. This is true not only of the original Marxian Socialists, but is true of the brainiest of the Socialist leaders to-day. They naturally have a feeling of contempt for the compromising and apologetic attitude adopted by some So-

cialist writers whose self-imposed mission is to brush away difficulties and to smooth off the rough edges of their cult as originally presented, and to form Political Socialist organizations whose main object is, for the time being, to catch votes. One has only to read current Socialist literature to see plenty of manifestations of this sentiment.

It is not the primary purpose of the writer to present an argument against Socialism by showing that in its very essence and its consequence it is both irreligious and immoral; but no adequate presentation of Socialism can be made which suppresses or glosses over the question of its relation to religion and social ethics. There are the very highest authorities for this position—no less authorities than Marx and Engels themselves. In the preface to his *Criticism of Political Economy* Marx says: "The method of production in our material life shapes and determines also our entire social, political, and intellectual process of life. It is not the mind of man which determines his life in society, but, on the contrary, it is this life which determines his mind." Engels tells us: "At the root of the materialistic conception of history there is the proposition that production, and next to production the exchange of products, forms the base of social order. . . . Accordingly, the ultimate causes of social changes and of political revolutions are not to be looked for in the brains of men and in their growing comprehension of eternal truth and justice, but in the changes affecting the manner of production and exchange." Speaking at the grave of Marx, Engels declared that as Darwin had discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so Marx had in the history of mankind, and he

expounded the Marxian Materialistic doctrine to mean that "the production of the immediate material means of life and the corresponding stage of economic evolution of a nation or epoch forms the foundation from which the civil institutions of the people in question, their ideas of law, of art, of religion even, have been developed and according to which they are to be explained—and not the reverse, as has been done heretofore."

Prof. Richard T. Ely (University of Wisconsin) may be described as a "Collectivist Opportunist," as practically a Fabian of a modified degree. He denies being a Socialist, as the term is accepted, and certainly he is not a Marxian; but he is recognized as an absolutely fair and a discriminating exponent of all schools. In his standard work, *Socialism and Social Reform,* he says that Marx "made Socialism a philosophy of every department of social life." And he goes on to state that "Socialism, to the strict Marxist, means a conception of religion, of literature, and of science, as well as of an economic philosophy." This, he explains, "is a natural consequence of his (Marx's) materialistic conception of history," which, however, he styles "an antiquated philosophy."

Without any reflection on their personal morality, it is only stating a self-confessed fact that in the ordinary acceptation of the word, Marx and Engels were atheists. In his *Landmarks of Scientific Socialism* Engels declares that "religion is nothing but the fantastic reflection in men's minds of the external forces which dominate their every-day existence, a reflection in which earthly forces take the form of the supernatural." In Engel's view, religion is nothing but the outcome of the

economic conditions arising from the present capitalistic system! His argument is involved, but stripped of philosophical terminology, it is that man seeks religion when he is not master of his own destiny—that, as he is a "slave," under the present capitalistic system, so therefore he seeks religion; but that when Socialism is established, then man will be "free," and then the very reason for the existence of religion will disappear! This argument was written in reply to the work of another Socialist who had advocated that when the Socialist Commonwealth was established, religion should be forbidden. But why, asked Engels, forbid a thing which would die a natural death?—as, in his opinion, religion must, under Socialism.

If the reader turns to the *Manifesto* of Marx and Engels—the epitome of Modern Socialism—he will find a number of references to religion and the family; and the authors acknowledge that Socialists are charged with the intention to abolish both. What is their reply? They do not deny the charge, but they indulge in some cynical remarks condemnatory of the prevailing religious ideas and of the marriage and family relationship, which they say are part of "the social consciousness of past ages . . . which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms." It is difficult to come to any other conclusion after reading their *Manifesto* than that Marx and Engels believed that the establishment of their Socialist State would inevitably lead to the disappearance of what is understood as orthodox religion, and, indeed, to a non-recognition of any supernatural or providential intervention in human affairs; and that it would also mean the abolition of the permanent monogamic mar-

riage relation and of the family as now constituted. These changes—which would, indeed, be "catastrophic" —would come about, it should be carefully noted, in the natural course of economic and social evolution, according to the strict, unadulterated Marxian theory of Scientific Socialism. It is true that there are Socialists like Thomas Kirkup who believe that Socialism will be "purified" as to both its economics and its ethics; there are those like Spargo who make special pleadings and apologetics for this phase of Socialism; and there are also Socialist political organizations which change their flag according to national prejudices, or shift it to catch passing breezes, and are prepared to change their creed to suit the fickle proletariat; but it is nevertheless true that nearly all the commanding intellects of Modern Socialism, from Owen, Marx and Engels down to the present-day leaders, hold to the doctrine: first, that Socialism affects all human affairs—ethical as well as economic; and secondly, that under Socialism religion will die a natural death (or will be suppressed forcibly), and that there will be a revolution in the present marriage and family relationship.

Speaking for the German Social Democracy in the Reichstag, on September 16, 1878, Bebel said: "Gentlemen, you attack our views on religion because they are atheistic and materialistic. I acknowledge the correctness of the impeachment. . . . I am fairly convinced that Socialism finally leads to atheism."

Socialism Involves Ethics as Well as Economics.

Morris and Bax boldly assert that under the Socialist order the particulars of life concerning marriage and the family would be affected not only economically, but

in ethics. They join in the common Socialist argument that at present the married woman is "an economic slave," she being a dependent of her husband; but they say that Socialism would bring about a condition of "freedom." As a logical consequence, they argue, according to the doctrine of "the materialistic conception of history," the marriage relation would also become "free," in this: that a new development would take place from which would ensue a relationship between a man and a woman based "on mutual inclination and affection, an association terminable at the will of either party. . . . There would be no vestige of reprobation weighing on the dissolution of one tie and the forming of another." (*Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome.*)

In the *Open Review* (London), of July, 1909, Bax had an article on "Definitions of Socialism," in which he vigorously protested against the recent tendency "to narrow down the definition of Socialism too exclusively and too formally to the central economic issue." As Bax is generally recognized as the most profound of all living Marxian Socialists in the English-speaking world, his article is partly quoted:

> . . . The attempt to define Socialism by a purely economic formula is not merely logically invalid and unsupported by the attitude, if not by the formal words, of the vast number of those who call themselves Socialists. It is also historically unjustifiable. The word, from its earliest use by Owen, Leroux, Reubaud, etc., in the thirties and forties of the last century, has always stood for a revolution, along certain well-defined lines, in human life generally. The attempt to limit it to a technical economic formula . . . is, as I have said, quite late. This attempt received one of its earliest expressions in English literature in Mr. Kirkup's article in

> the "Encyclopædia Britannica" [ninth edition]. . . . His example has since been followed by a large number of exponents, hostile and friendly. It is difficult to say how, in the view of the history of the word, the exponents in question justified this restriction of meaning. The "materialist doctrine of history" of Marx certainly emphasizes the economic basis of the social life of man, as in a sense the cause of all other manifestations of that life, even those seemingly most remote, but in practice even the strictest adherents of the doctrine in question assume the results of the economic change as taking place along definite lines, alike as regards man's "view of the world," as regards the family relation, and as regards political issues, and do not hesitate to say so as occasion arises. It is well known that they are in favor of freer marriage relations, of the recognition by society of the conclusions of science as opposed to theological conceptions, and of democratic republicanism as against all forms of monarchical or oligarchic rule. In these demands they undoubtedly carry on the tradition of historical Socialism, and the Marxian party, using the word in its larger meaning in the present day, is practically conterminous with the International Socialist movement. . . . Most Marxians do admit, that as above said, these other changes are involved in the economic change itself, for as such they cannot fail to be regarded as forming part and parcel of the changed conditions of the new society, which is only another way of saying that they must form an essential element in the complete ideal of Socialism.

It is not necessary to multiply examples. The present book is mainly an exposition and history of Socialism, and is not concerned with criticism except incidentally; and the references here made and the quotations given are only presented because, according to the very highest authorities, this aspect of Socialism is a fundamental part of the system. In all fairness it must be recorded that there are thousands of good religious men calling themselves Christian Socialists, as well as

certain professors of an elastic modified Marxism (like Kirkup and Spargo), who indignantly deny that repudiation of Divine Providence and an upsetting of the present marriage and family relations are contemplated by or would result from Socialism, any more than that such eventualities can be associated with Republicanism or Democracy, or with Toryism or Liberalism—although they freely admit that Socialists themselves are largely responsible for the criticisms made in these respects. They point to the fact that there are atheists and immoral men connected with the parties named, and they ask whether atheism and immorality are therefore to be considered as part of their principles? Clearly not; but there is a great difference in the two cases. Mr. Ingersoll was an agnostic and also a Republican; does that fact make the Republican Party an agnostic party? By no means. Marx and Engels were agnostics—atheists, and also Socialists; does that make the Socialist Party an agnostic, an atheistic party? Certainly not. But the comparisons are incomplete, and the argument of the Socialist apologists is inadequate. Mr. Ingersoll never claimed that agnosticism had anything to do with Republicanism, or that it was an irresistible tendency and outcome of Republicanism. But, on the other hand, Marx and Engels, and most of the other great shining intellectual exponents of Modern Socialism, have asserted that the philosophy of Socialism embraces all the relations and phases of human life—ethical as well as economic; and that the inevitable tendency and outcome of the application of the principles of Socialism will be the natural death or the abolition of supernatural religion and the destruction of the existing sexual and family status. Furthermore, if one

of the principal "fundamentals" of Socialism (viz., the materialistic conception of history) be sound, then no declaration by any man or any set of men, no repudiating resolution by a congress of vote-catching Socialist politicians, no legislation by a Socialist State even, can alter the inevitable tendency and outcome of Socialism—for Socialism is a principle, not a creed or scheme! The question is: Who is to decide what that tendency is and what the outcome will be? Shall it be the Socialist politicians or the intellectual leaders and expounders of Socialism?

Wages and Distribution of Products.

Assuming the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth, the next question to arise in the mind of a practical man would naturally be: How are the workers to be remunerated? On what principle are they to receive their quantum of subsistence and of the conveniences, luxuries, and pleasures of life?

Here again there are wide differences among Socialists. As a practical matter, it is the most important in the entire discussion; and it is perfectly fair and reasonable to demand from Socialists an intelligent answer, for according to their theory all the relations of life depend upon the "bread and butter" problem. Some Socialists ignore the question; and that is certainly the easiest way to dispose of it. Others, with much elaboration, suggest methods of "equitably" distributing among the workers the products of their labor and their share of the general possessions of the community, whether in goods or money; and not a few of these ingenious gentlemen are sarcastic as well as dogmatic toward those who presume to question the prac-

ticability, the equity, or the wisdom of their plans. Others say that it is not important, in any case, and that the question will settle itself after the establishment of Socialism.

The general question of remuneration, or the sharing of the public property, has a number of aspects, the most prominent of them being:

(1) The assignment and apportionment of labor.

(2) The distribution of the products. Is it to be according to *deeds* or according to *needs?*

(3) Is payment to be in "kind," in "labor checks," or in money?

(1) A number of Scientific Socialist writers, while repudiating Bellamy's Utopianism in *Looking Backward,* have imitated him in setting forth plans showing how easy it will be to arrange all these "trivial details." But the schemes for arranging matters are very diverse, and sometimes conflicting. Some Socialists say that every man would have to work at whatever he was assigned to do; others that he would be allowed to choose his occupation, unless that particular sphere of labor was overcrowded; some maintain that every man would have to take his turn at disagreeable and laborious occupations, while others suggest that the best way would be to induce men to do this class of work by making their hours of labor very short; and still others contend that those who performed dangerous or unpleasant work should be looked upon as civic heroes, and should be rewarded with medals. As to the lazy, most Socialists agree that these pests should be made to work, by force, if necessary; while some optimists profess to believe that when the spirit of Socialism had

thoroughly permeated humanity, all such vices as laziness would disappear from the face of the earth.

(2) This is one of "the hardest nuts to crack" in the entire range of Socialist problems. Of course, "the authorities" are all at sea with respect to a solution. Most of them agree at the outset, that the distribution must be "equitable;" but when details are faced the difficulties begin. Moreover, there is a general policy pursued by Socialist advocates of avoiding the difficulties; and some speakers and writers lightly dispose of the question by saying that it is one of those "inconsequential things" which can easily be settled when King Demos sits upon his throne! The difficulty is, they plead, not in distributing the product of labor, but in getting away from the capitalist the undue share which he now receives; and it is to be observed that at Socialist meetings this remark always brings out loud applause. But some conscientious (although probably unwise) Socialists have bravely attempted to show how the problem can be satisfactorily solved; and naturally, they do not agree among themselves. Some insist that a man should be paid the exact (or approximately exact) value of the product of his work—they ignoring the difficulty of determining that in "socialized" industries; while there are those who claim that if a man worked the number of hours allotted to him, he should be paid the standard wage, or receive his proportionate share of the standard amount of the product earned by the entire group or community, irrespective of his skill or the quantity of his individual product.

A reference to Chapter II ("What is Socialism?") will show that there is ample authority—including Marx

himself—for the contention that Socialism implies a bestowal of commodities "according to *needs*."

(3) "Up-to-date" Socialists have generally abandoned the original Utopian theory (advanced by Marx in his miscellaneous writings) of rewarding labor on the statistical system of the "time-basis"—that is, of finding out the number of hours socially necessary to produce the required amount of commodities, first for a given commodity, and then applying the principle universally, the State giving the workmen "time certificates" exchangeable for supplies. Of course, such a system would preclude the possibility of rewarding a workman according to his labor, as the poor and slow workman would receive the same compensation as the skilled and rapid workman; yet, it is a favorite claim of Socialists that the workman should receive the full product of his labor. Kirkup remarks (*Inquiry into Socialism*) that this claim "is plausible in appearance, but when examined is found to be void of meaning, for in the highly organized industry of the present, which is really a co-operation of the whole working society inheriting the labors of the past, how can we discriminate the individual share of each worker?" Hillquit takes the view that the "time-certificate" plan is out of the question, he saying (*Socialism in Theory and Practice*):

> Modern Socialists recognize that the methods of distribution under the new order of things must take for their starting point the present methods, *i. e.*, payments of varying wages or salaries for services rendered.
>
> Here again we run counter to a deep-rooted popular conception, or rather misconception, of the Socialist program. One of the pet schemes of the early Socialist experimenters

> was the substitution of "labor certificates" or "time certificates" for money. . . . Modern Socialists have long discarded all miniature social experimentations and arbitrary social devices as Utopian and puerile.

Some Socialists and most critics claim that Marx himself favored the labor-time-basis as an equitable scheme for distributing the proceeds of labor under Socialism; but this is denied by other expounders. The latter contend that Marx's time theory only applies to the production of private property under the present capitalistic system. This may be true as to *Capital,* but Marx certainly favored the labor-time-basis in other writings. But there is now a general recognition on the part of well-informed Socialists that it would be impracticable and unfair to apply it to work under the Co-operative Commonwealth. Indeed, the old original Communistic doctrine of "share-and-share-alike" is again becoming the accepted doctrine—providing, of course, that this principle be applied only to those who work according to their ability. It is unfair to charge Modern Socialists with an intention to reward the lazy equally with the industrious—although coupled with that statement should go the observation that according to Socialists the amount of work required from each man will be so small and will require such a short time each day [some put it as low as two hours!] that even the chronically lazy ones will not object to do their apportionment. Hillquit says (*Theory and Practice*):

> The Socialists do not offer a cut and dried plan of wealth distribution.
>
> As a proposition of abstract justice and fairness there is no reason why any discrimination at all should be made in

> the distribution of the necessaries and material comforts of life between the members of the community. The increased productivity of labor and the consequent augmentation of wealth are due to the concerted efforts of men in all fields of endeavor, physical and mental, in generations past as well as present, and the precise share of each individual in the general wealth of the nation is altogether insusceptible of measurement.
>
> . . . To the Socialists the old Communistic motto: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," generally appears as the ideal rule of distribution in an enlightened human society, and quite likely the time will come when that high standard will be generally adopted by civilized communities. . . . But just and feasible as this ideal method of distribution may be, it is to-day nevertheless a mere ideal, a hope to be realized in the more or less distant future. It is not a part of the present programme of Socialist movement.

But Hillquit does not meet the question. He does not explain how his particular school of Socialists propose to decide as to assignment of work and the amount of wages to be paid to each man.

Spargo is equally vague as to the actual practice to be adopted. He freely admits, however, "that approximate equality of income is the ideal to be ultimately aimed at." Otherwise—and here he agrees with Mrs. Besant—class distinctions would inevitably reappear, and the old struggle for equality would have to be fought over again. But Spargo also quotes with approval the declaration of Kautsky (who he says is "perhaps the greatest living exponent of the theories of Modern Socialism) that "wages, unequal and paid in money, will be the method of remuneration for labor in the Socialist regime."

CHAPTER IX

SOCIALISM IN AMERICA

The first recorded Socialist declaration in America was in New York in 1829, during an agitation against increased hours of labor, when a mechanic named Thomas Skidmore drew up an agrarian preamble, which has been described as "transporting into economics the Declaration of Independence." In that document it was resolved that "the Creator has made all equal," and that "in the first formation of government no man gives up to others his original right of soil and becomes a smith, a weaver, a builder, or other mechanic or laborer, without receiving a guaranty that reasonable toil shall enable him to live as comfortable as others." Part of the movement drifted into Owenism, and what was left received its death-blow through the political strategy of that horny-handed friend of Labor—Tammany.

Backwardism of American Socialism.

It cannot be said that the history of Socialism in America since then has been a very successful one, whatever it may be in the future; in fact, as an organized force, Scientific Socialism is less in evidence in America than in any other progressive country in the world, although Utopianism has been experimented with to a greater extent here than anywhere else.

Speaking generally, Socialists have been able to secure but very few representatives in Municipal Councils or in State Legislatures, or to elect State officers—Wisconsin being a notable exception. No Socialist has ever been elected to Congress as such until Victor Berger was elected in 1910, and, indeed, it is probably true that no Socialist was ever elected to Congress before last year, even as a member of one of the orthodox parties, although sometimes "Populists" have been erroneously called Socialists. This is remarkable in view of the fact that the United States is the greatest democracy in the world, and possesses universal manhood suffrage. Socialism is now a political force to be reckoned with in the Parliaments of all European countries, and also in several of the Legislatures of the British self-governing colonies. In 1909 little Holland had 10 Socialist representatives in her Parliament; Sweden had 15; Denmark had 24; Italy had 25; Belgium had 30; Germany had 43; Great Britain had in 1906-1909 55 (Labor-Socialists); New Zealand had 60; France had 75; Finland had 80; and Austria had 87. And the number is increasing, particularly in Germany.

There are a number of reasons to account for the fact that Socialism has not made much progress in the United States, the principal ones being: The general spirit of strong individuality and self-reliance; the widespread prosperity of all classes, as compared with the people of other countries; the innate political conservatism of native Americans, which disinclines them to take up experiments in government, especially where property rights and constitutional personal prerogatives are involved; the comparative absence of "class consciousness" on the part of the working men (although

a change is now manifest in this regard); the fact that it has been the almost unbroken rule—until recently—for organized workingmen to refrain from separate political action, and, indeed, from participation in politics whatever, but to confine themselves to their own special trade matters, or at the most only to interest themselves in matters of general social reform outside the sphere of politics. Occasionally Trade Unions have broken the rule referred to, but in nearly every instance it has spelt disaster to the organization. Within the last few years, however, there have been indications of a change of attitude in this regard by organized Labor. The Socialists are keenly alive to the situation, and they expect that the near future will witness a great accession to their ranks from the Trade Unionists—and possibly an actual official working arrangement between the Unions and Socialism.

Modern Political Socialism made its appearance in America some years after Utopian Socialism had practically died out. The movements were totally independent of each other, and yet, of course, the public attention which had been developed by the communal experiments led to a trend of thought in the direction of Scientific Socialism. Unlike Trade Unionism, Socialism was foreign in its origin. The movements in New York in 1868-9, which were the pioneers of present-day Socialism in America, were confined almost exclusively to foreigners by birth, Germans principally, with a sprinkling of other peoples of Continental origin. Nearly all of the first real Socialists in America were recently-arrived immigrants; but it has been noted that the second generation are seldom Socialists. This drifting away from Socialism on the part of "Americanized"

Germans, for instance, is to be observed in the history of the "Turner" organization, which originally was semi-Socialist. Socialism never became important as a possible political or economic force until its personnel in organization, its methods, and its expression had become relatively "Americanized," although there are those who insist that Socialism proper can never be made adaptable to or be in harmony with "the American spirit."

Foreign in origin though it be (like many other things in America—some of them most excellent), the day has passed when that fact can prevent a fair consideration of the claims of Socialism by native Americans; and, indeed, it would be unwise and useless to fail to recognize that Socialism has at last secured a hold on the body-politic of America, with whatever errors, political, economic and ethical, may be attached to it.

The "International" and American Socialists.

As the outcome of a movement started in 1863, a convention of representatives of over sixty labor organizations was held at Baltimore, Md., in August, 1866, and the National Labor Union was formed. "The first and grand desideratum of the hour, in order to deliver the Labor of the country from the thraldom of capital, is the enactment of a law whereby eight hours shall be made to constitute a legal day's work," was the principal resolution adopted at this convention. An attempt was made to induce the organization to enter the political field, but without success. Another effort was made at the next convention, in 1867, and the president advocated the establishment of official relations with the

European "International," a society which had for its object the uniting of the working classes of all nations in one Socialistic organization. But the National Labor Union decided not to join the "International." However, it adopted the following resolution:

> *Whereas,* The efforts of the working classes in Europe to acquire political power, to improve their social conditions, and to emancipate themselves from the bondage under which they were and still are, are gratifying proof of the progress of justice, enlightenment, and civilization;
>
> *Resolved,* That the National Labor Convention hereby declares its sympathies, and promises its co-operation to the organized workingmen of Europe in their struggle against political and social injustice.

At the next convention, held in New York in 1868, the Union became the National Reform Party, and definitely committed itself to political action. The president of this new party—the first real national political Labor party in America—was a very able man, William H. Silvis, who was the President of the Iron Molders' National Union, and one of the founders of the National Labor Union. He announced that the object of the Labor Reform Party, as a workingmen's party, was to get control of Congress and the several State Legislatures. As showing the necessity of the new party, he declared that: "The working people of our nation, white and black, male and female, are sinking to a condition of serfdom. Even now a slavery exists in our land worse than ever existed under the old slave system." At the fourth convention of the National Labor Union (or, as it was sometimes called, National Labor Party, or National Reform Party), in 1869, it was decided to send an official representative

to the convention of the "International" to be held at Basle, Switzerland, in 1870, and A. C. Cameron was sent as delegate. It seems that Mr. Cameron did not participate in the deliberations, but contented himself with giving grossly exaggerated accounts of the strength of the organization he represented, he claiming, among other things, that he was the delegate of 800,000 American workingmen who had adopted the principles of the "International." At the convention of the National Labor Union at Cincinnati, in August, 1870, the following resolution was adopted: "The National Labor Union declares its adherence to the principles of the International Workingmen's Association, and expects to join the said association in a short time." But it never joined the "International;" on the contrary, it finally became non-existent as a separate organization; several attempts to revive it were made, but without success.

The first body in America to be directly affiliated with the "International" was a German independent political-labor organization called The Social Party of New York and Vicinity. After making one campaign (and it was a very insignificant one) it dissolved, and from its membership was formed the General German Labor Association (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein). The principles of this association were "strictly Marxian," and Hillquit says that the latest phase of the Socialist movement in this country may be said to date from the organization of that society. In 1869 it was admitted to the National Labor Union, and in the same year it also joined the European "International," becoming "Section 1 of New York." The previous year a section of the "International" had been established by German Socialists in San Francisco; in 1869 a German section

was formed at Chicago; and in 1870 a French Section was organized at New York.

The "International" Transferred to New York.

In the meantime, there was trouble in the "International" itself, growing out of the struggle for control by Marx and Bakounin (the Russian Anarchist). Although Marx spoke of the beaten communards of Paris as the "glorious vanquished," he was comparatively a conservative at the period of 1871; and at the congress of the "International" at The Hague, Holland, in 1872, Bakounin was "excommunicated" by Marx and his followers because of his extreme views. But the situation on the Continent was not satisfactory to Marx; the United States looked encouraging as a field of operations just at that time; and so Marx transferred the General Council of the organization to New York. Its career in America was brief and disastrous. There had been quarrels among the American sections before the General Council came to New York; the different racial elements were discordant, and the "International" became the "dumping ground" for all the fads and "crankisms" of the day. Yet for a time it spread; the labor troubles of 1873 were largely manipulated by the extremists of the society; and from its activity in Chicago there grew a new Socialist party—the Labor Party of Illinois. In April, 1874, the second national convention of the American sections of the "International" was held at Philadelphia. The Socialists of the country were in a demoralized condition, and an organization had been started in New York as a rival to the International—the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party of North America. At the Philadelphia convention the

Federal Council of the American sections was abolished; its functions were turned over to the General Council (which was international in scope), and it was now established at New York. The "International" forbade any member belonging to any other party, but announced that it would not itself enter into a campaign until it could effect some result. The convention, which was held at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 15, 1876, was the last: it was a most melancholy funeral of an organization which in its hey-day had made "tyrants tremble" by the thunders of its resolutions and its proclamations. There were only eleven delegates present—ten representing the United States, and one representing Germany. The General Council was abolished, and that was the end of the once great International Workingmen's Association. Before adjourning, the handful of delegates adopted what was intended to be an encouraging manifesto to the working men of the world, and it wound up with the Marxian injunction: "Proletarians of all countries, Unite!"

The Socialist Labor Party.

The origin of the Socialist Labor Party—which is still in existence, and had a candidate for the Presidency of the United States at the election of 1908—is owing to the squabbles which took place among the sections of the "International." On the 4th of July, 1874, the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party of North America was formed by a number of seceding members. In 1875 one of its most prominent members was R. A. Parsons, who later paid the penalty of his life for his share in the tragedy of the Chicago "Haymarket" demonstration. In July, 1876, there was held

a convention of representatives of a number of Labor-Socialist organizations, among them being delegates from the Social Workingmen's Association. The several organizations consolidated under the name of the Workingmen's Party of the United States; and in 1877, at the second convention of that party, held at Newark, N. J., the name was changed to the Socialist Labor Party of the United States.

For the first time in their history the Socialists of America now had a party which had shown any coherency; but already even this party is giving evidence that it will soon be nothing but a name, and will have to give up what is now really the ghost of an organization. The first great difficulty was in connection with the attempt to "Americanize" the movement, for there was a strong popular feeling—which still exists, even among workingmen—that Socialism is alien to American institutions and ideas.

A number of members of the Socialist Labor Party left it and formed a Revolutionary Club in New York, the principles of which were a mixture of German Social Democracy and Anarchism. Other revolutionary clubs were formed, and a convention of these clubs was held at Chicago, in October, 1881. After a period of depression caused by the defections of anarchistically inclined members, the Socialist Labor Party had a more favorable outlook; following the shock incidental to the Chicago drama there was a revival of genuine Socialism, and in 1900 the organization reached its zenith. It had taken part in several local and state compaigns, and in 1892 it for the first time nominated candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States. Following are the Socialist Labor Party candidates for

President of the United States and the votes cast in the respective years:

1892—Simon Wing 21,164;
1896—Charles H. Matchett.....36,274;
1900—Jos. H. Malloney.....39,739;
1904—Charles H. Corrigan.....31,249;
1908—August Gillhaus .....32,000.

The principal declaration in the platform of the Socialist Labor Party is as follows:

> With the founders of this republic we hold that the true theory of politics is that the machinery of government must be owned and controlled by the whole people; but in the light of our industrial development we hold, furthermore, that the true theory of economics is that the machinery of production must likewise belong to the people in common.

The Socialist Labor Party calls upon "the wage workers of the United States, and upon all other honest citizens," to organize into "a class-conscious body," so that an end may be put to the present barbarous class-struggle, "by the abolition of classes, the restoration of the land, and of all the means of production, transportation, and distribution to the people as a collective body, and the substitution of the Co-operative Commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war, and social disorder."

There are two special reasons why the Socialist Labor Party has failed to secure a large membership: (1) It has been too rigidly Marxian, and the profound revolutionary philosophy of that system does not appeal to the native American mind any more than it does to the British; and (2) it has been unsympathetic towards and

often hostile to Trade Unions; and to the intensely practical American workingman the advantages of Trade Unionism are far more apparent, direct and personal, than are the supposititious benefits to be derived from the nebulous theories of Socialism.

The Socialist Party.

The history of the Socialist Party (Social Democratic Party) is a brief and simple one up to the present stage. It is a development from the American Railway Union, which was formed in June, 1893, principally through the efforts of Eugene V. Debs. After the disastrous strike of the Pullman employees in 1894, with which the Railway Union was identified—and the failure of which practically caused its collapse—the Social Democracy of America was formed in 1897, at the final convention of the Railway Union. At the first convention of the Social Democracy of America, held at Chicago in June, 1898, some of the delegates indulged in what seems to be a mania in American labor-reform movements—they "bolted," and the "bolters" formed a new organization with a similar name—the Social Democratic Party. It was a party of avowed Socialism, for by this time Eugene V. Debs had become a follower of Marx, and he got to be the leader of the new Social Democratic Party, as he had been of the Railway Union. In July, 1901, an amalgamation was effected between the Social Democratic Party and another organization, first called the Rochester (N. Y.) Socialist Labor Party, and afterward also claiming the name of the Social Democratic Party; and the united organization of these two rival bodies (both at that time bearing the name of the Social Democratic Party) was given the name of

the Socialist Party. It is this party whose candidate Mr. Debs has been several times for the Presidency of the United States; and it is the only organization professing international, "class-conscious," Scientific Socialism which has firmly established itself and developed any considerable strength in America. It has a large and growing number of newspapers, weekly, semi-monthly, and monthly journals and reviews. While professedly Marxian, it is becoming increasingly Opportunist or Constructive.

The first plank of the platform of the Socialist Party is as follows:

> The Socialist party of America, in national convention assembled, reaffirms its adherence to the principles of international Socialism, and declares its aim to be the organization of the working class and those in sympathy with it into a political party, with the object of conquering the powers of government and using them for the purpose of transforming the present system of private ownership of the means of production and distribution into collective ownership by the entire people.

But while aiming at the ultimate collective ownership of the means of production and distribution, the Socialist Party supports all active efforts of the working class to better its condition and to elect Socialists to political offices, in order to facilitate the attainment of this end. As such means it advocates:

> 1. The public ownership of all means of transportation and communication and all other public utilities, as well as of all industries, controlled by monopolies, trusts, and combines. No part of the revenue of such industries to be applied to the reduction of taxes on property of the capitalist class, but to be applied wholly to the increase of wages and shortening of the hours of labor of the employees, to the

improvement of the service and diminishing the rates to the consumers.

2. The progressive reduction of the hours of labor and the increase of wages in order to decrease the share of the capitalist and increase the share of the worker in the product of labor.

3. State or national insurance of working people in case of accidents, lack of employment, sickness, and want in old age; the funds for this purpose to be collected from the revenue of the capitalist class, and to be administered under the control of the working class.

4. The inauguration of a system of public industries, public credit to be used for that purpose in order that the workers be secured the full product of their labor.

5. The education of all, state and municipal aid for books, clothing and food.

6. Equal civil and political rights for men and women.

7. The initiative and referendum, proportional representation, and the right of recall of representatives by their constituents.

But in advocating these measures as steps in the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth, we warn the working class against the so-called public-ownership movements as an attempt of the capitalist class to secure governmental control of public utilities for the purpose of obtaining greater security in the exploitation of other industries and not for the amelioration of the conditions of the working class.

Beginners in the study of Socialism are often perplexed over the fact that while its adherents rail at the capitalists who own trusts and trade combinations, yet they are tolerant and often commendatory of the collective principle and competition-destroying effect of the trusts and combinations themselves. The Socialist Party in their general statement of principles at the convention of 1908 give the explanation of this apparent anomaly, they saying: "The basis for such transforma-

tion (from private to collective ownership) is rapidly developing within present capitalist society. The factory system, with its complex machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestiges of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process. The great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have organized the work and management of the principal industries on a national scale, and have fitted them for collective use and operation."

Young as is the Socialist movement in America, properly speaking, it has already encountered a form of opposition which the Socialists of Europe—and particularly of England within the last few years—have found to be the most powerful which they have so far encountered since Marx and Engels issued their *Communist Manifesto* in 1848. Reference is here made to the charge that Marxist Socialism is atheistic and immoral. The Socialist Party of America recognize the seriousness of this charge, for in their declaration of 1908 they say: "The Socialist Party is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with matters of religious belief." [It is to be observed, however, that the declaration is qualified by the word "primarily."]

The convention extended the former "general demands," by including the employment by the government of the workless in building schools; reforestration and reclamation of cut-over and waste lands; the building of canals, etc.; the loaning of public money to municipalities, without interest, for public works; the contribution of public funds to Trade Unions; the exten-

sion of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests, and water-powers; and demanded that the occupancy and use of land should be the sole title to possession. Its political demands included the extension of inheritance taxes; a graduated income tax; and "the abolition of the power usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed or abrogated only by act of Congress or by a referendum of the whole people." Demands were also made that the constitution of the United States should be made amendable by majority vote; that all judges be elected by the people for short terms; that the power to issue injunctions be curbed by immediate legislation; and for the free administration of justice.

The Socialist Party has regular state organizations in every state of the Union with the exception of a few of the Southern States. Ever since 1899 it has elected a small number of state and local officials, particularly in the Middle and far-Western states.

As it accepts the platform and principles of the International Socialist movement, the American Socialist Party is represented at the International Socialist Bureau, at Brussels (the executive department of the successor of the old "International"), and takes part in the congresses of the International Party of Socialism.

Following are the number of votes cast in the Presidential elections for Mr. Debs, as the candidate of the Social Party:

1900 ..... 87,814;
1904 ..... 402,283;
1908 ..... 482,000.

It should be remembered that there are two Socialist Parties in the United States, and that the other, the Socialist Labor Party, cast 32,000 votes for its candidate for the Presidency last year. If this number be added to the votes cast for Mr. Debs, it shows that in 1908 there were 514,000 Socialist voters in the United States —about one Socialist in every twenty-eight of the entire number of voters in the country.

In the various State and local elections held in 1910 the Socialist vote was largely increased; in some States it was doubled. The aggregate of the votes for Congressmen was 720,000.

In the local elections of November, 1911, throughout the country, there were large Socialist gains. In Ohio nine small towns elected Socialist Mayors, and in Columbus, the State capital, four Socialist members of Council were elected. It is difficult to say to what extent these victories were owing to the spread of real Socialist sentiment among the voters. In nearly every instance there were special reasons for the consolidation of the votes of the members of Labor organizations; then the working people of the entire country had allowed Socialist orators to inflame them by representing that the capitalists and the Government were persecuting the McNamara brothers, then under trial for dynamiting the office of the *Times,* of Los Angeles, Cal.; and, furthermore, there was a general spirit of discontent with existing economic and political conditions. A Socialist leader of Columbus (O.) frankly gives it as his opinion that of all the votes cast for Socialist candidates, only about one-third represented actual Socialist sentiment.

Anarchism in America.

There have been several outbreaks of violence in America in connection with labor disputes which are generally described as "anarchistic" or "socialistic." The most dreadful of these deplorable incidents is associated with the "Haymarket" of Chicago. Another, of evil notoriety, is connected with a strike of miners in Colorado.

Frankness compels the admission that violence is a more frequent accompaniment of Labor disputes in America than in Great Britain or Germany. But at the outset it should also be said that the real, representative leaders of organized Labor in America are as much opposed to violence and unlawful methods as are the present-day Labor leaders of Great Britain.

While the American and the British love of law and order are the same fundamentally, there is in America, as compared with England, a more "rough-and-ready" method of action, not only on the part of the men on strike and of the employers also, but by the State authorities themselves, when—as often happens—they are called upon to suppress disorder. In America the police and the military sometimes use force in a manner and to a degree that would not be tolerated in England; and in that country there is no such body as "Pinkerton men." In the "good old days" there used to be a great deal of violence in trade disputes in England, and even to-day the British workingman out on a strike is not a "lamb" by any means; and the British Trade Unionist or Socialist is not conspicuous for his tolerance or consideration toward those who are not of his way of thinking—this fact being illustrated by outrages by Welsh miners in 1909 and 1910, and by the

sailors and dock laborers at the great shipping ports of England and Scotland in 1911.

Anarchism in the United States must be taken first as generally of alien conception, as only a passing phase of social conditions—as an incident of the moment, and largely of local environment, and also of individual rashness and folly. Properly speaking, it cannot be considered to be a development of genuine Socialism, much less of genuine Trade Unionism. Anarchism as a system, even philosophical Anarchism, may be said to be non-existent in America, as it is also not to be found in Great Britain. There are a few—and a very few—unpractical, dreamy, philosophical "arm-chair" Anarchists in America; but they are perfectly harmless. And there are also a few unhappy men, of both native and foreign birth, who probably are only restrained by the fear of the gallows from throwing an occasional bomb at some unpopular capitalist. But Anarchism as an organized, permanent system is practically a political and social impossibility in America.

Chicago and Cincinnati have the unenviable notoriety of being the recruiting grounds of the first active revolutionary anarchistic organization in America, outside of several clubs in New York, which latter appear to have been little more than societies for indulgence in beery symposiums. But the Anarchists of Chicago and Cincinnati evidently thought that they meant business, for they organized several military companies under the name of Educational and Defensive Societies (Lehr and Wehr Vereine). The national committee of the Socialist Labor Party repudiated these mischievous "side-shows" of their organization, and requested all genuine Socialists to withdraw from them. In November, 1880,

some seceders from the Socialist Labor Party formed Revolutionary Clubs at New York and a number of the other large cities of the country. One was formed at Chicago, and at its head were Paul Grottkau, August Spies and Albert R. Parsons. In October, 1881, these Revolutionary Clubs reorganized themselves into the Revolutionary Socialist Party. In October, 1883, a joint convention of Anarchists and revolutionist Socialists was held at Pittsburg, and the International Working People's Association was formed. A fiery "proclamation" was issued, its authors probably being conceited enough to imagine that the document would become as historic as the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels. This "proclamation" stated the object of the movement to be: "The destruction of the existing class government by all means, *i. e.*, by energetic, implacable, revolutionary, and international action," and the establishment of a system of industry based on "the free exchange of equivalent products between the producing organizations themselves and without the intervention of middlemen and profit-making."

Unfortunately for law and order and the good name of Trade Unionism and of Socialism proper, there had just come over from the old world the Prince of Anarchy—the incarnation of revolution against authority —John Most, who had recently finished a term in an English prison for lauding the assassins of the Russian Emperor and inciting others to follow their example; and he stirred up the mess that was brewing in the witches' cauldron at Chicago.

May 1, 1886, was the day fixed for a general strike throughout the United States and Canada to gain the eight-hour day, this step having been determined upon

two years previously by the Federation of Trades and Labor Unions. During these two years the spirit of unrest and discontent had been growing among the working people, and it was worse in Chicago than anywhere else. In that city was a section of the American International (not, however, connected with the old European "International"), and it had become an anarchistic organization. The "Information Bureau" of the Anarchists was at Chicago, and there were three anarchistic papers published in that city—two German, with Justus Schwab and August Spies as principal writers, and A. Fischer as foreman; and one in the English language, with Albert R. Parsons as the editor. It is difficult after this lapse of time subsequent to the affair to understand how sane men could have acted as the Chicago Anarchists did; and some responsibility must rest upon organized Labor and its so-called leaders. The working people got stirred up to a great pitch of excitement; meetings were held, and the most incendiary language was used; and the Anarchist papers raved as if only civil war could prevent the rights of the wage earners from being taken away. At one meeting, held near a factory, violence was manifested against some non-union workers. The police were sent for and came in large numbers, and volleys of stones greeted them, they replying with their revolvers. Some pistol shots were returned by the mob. At this the police fired a fusillade, and four of the crowd were killed and a great many were wounded. Then the Anarchists issued a circular headed "Revenge!" The workingmen were urged to arm themselves, and on the next evening a meeting was held for the purpose of "branding the murder of our fellow-workers." The meeting proper

seems to have been over, but at a later gathering, which was being addressed by an Anarchist, a large force of police arrived, and the commanding officer ordered the crowd to disperse. A dynamite bomb was thrown from an alley between two companies of police, but, strange to say, only one was killed, although a number were injured. Then a regular pitched battle occurred between the crowd and the police, and half a dozen policemen and four workingmen were killed, and a great many on both sides were wounded. It has never been definitely settled who threw the bomb, but a number of the agitators were indicted, they being charged with the murder of the policeman who was killed by the bomb. August Spies, Samuel Fielden, Michael Schwab, Albert R. Parsons, Adolph Fischer, George Engel, and Louis Lingg were found guilty of murder, and the penalty was fixed at death. On an appeal to the Governor of Illinois for clemency, the sentences of Schwab and Fielden were commuted to life imprisonment. Lingg committed suicide in his cell by exploding a cartridge in his mouth. Spies, Parsons, Fischer, and Engel were hanged on November 11th, 1887. These men had undoubtedly worked themselves up to such a condition of mind that they really believed they were Labor's martyrs; and it is said that they all died bravely. As the noose was placed around the neck of Spies, he said: "The time will come when our silence in the grave will be more eloquent than our speeches!" The last words of Parsons were: "Let the voice of the people be heard!" "This is the happiest moment of my life!" exclaimed Fischer, as he ascended the scaffold. Six years afterwards, John P. Altgeld, who had been elected Governor of the State, granted an absolute pardon to

Samuel Fielden, Oscar Neebe, and Michael Schwab, and in doing so he took occasion to denounce what he termed the unfair and partial methods of the trial judge. The latter (Judge Gary) defended the verdict in a long article in the *Century Magazine*. In this article the judge pointed out that the defendants were found guilty and sentenced not because they were Anarchists, but because they were parties to murder. "The conviction proceeded upon the ground that they had generally, by speech and print, advised large classes to commit murder; and had left the commission, the time and place, and when to the individual will and whim or caprice. . . . They incited, advised, encouraged the throwing of the bomb that killed the policeman not by addressing the bomb-thrower specially, . . . but by general addresses to readers and hearers."

The Moyer-Haywood Murder Case.

A score of years after the awful affair at Chicago, there were a most sensational series of outrages in Colorado and elsewhere in the Western mining States, resulting in the trial of three Labor leaders for murder. In 1899 the Legislature of Colorado had passed an eight-hour law for the miners of that state, but the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional. In 1902, however, the miners were powerful enough to secure the passage by the people of a constitutional amendment making it mandatory on the Legislature to pass an eight-hour law. But the succeeding Legislature failed to do so. Thereupon the miners of Colorado struck for eight hours and for the settlement of some grievances. There undoubtedly was violence upon the part of individual miners, even though the Union were not directly or

officially implicated. The mine-owners, on their part, were not over-gentle in their methods, and they evicted a number of the miners from their cottages. The state troops were called out, and the strike was "broken."

On December 30th, 1905, Frank Steunenberg, the former Governor of Idaho, an adjoining State, was assassinated by means of an infernal machine placed at the front gate of his residence. Governor Steunenberg had had some unpleasant experiences with the miners of his own State, and the common supposition was that his murder was an act of revenge. Some weeks afterwards four leaders of the Western Federation of Miners were arrested, charged with the murder, they being Charles H. Moyer (the President of the Federation of Miners), William D. Haywood (the Secretary), and two other prominent leaders named Pettibone and St. John. [Incidentally it may be noted that the Western Federation of Miners has declared for Socialism.] The principal witness against the accused was a self-confessed professional murderer—for pay! The story he told was one of the wildest and most extraordinary ever told in a criminal court. In effect his evidence was that the officials of the Miners' Union had gone into the business of wholesale murder, and had employed him as one of their instruments. The trial was in many respects the most remarkable ever held in any civilized country. The defence was first a plea of innocence, and secondly a counter-charge which in substance was that the mine-owners of Colorado were a set of blood-thirsty wretches, without conscience, who, in order to get rid of the labor-leaders, had employed "agents provocateurs." A verdict of not guilty was rendered.

One of the most sensational incidents connected with

the trial was the denunciation of the defendants, while the case was still *sub judice,* by Mr. Roosevelt, the President of the United States, he denouncing them as "undesirable citizens"—a term which at once became notorious.

The McNamara Outrages.

The year 1911 will always be memorable in the annals of American organized Labor because of the arrest and subsequent confession of three wretches—two brothers named McNamara and another man named McManigal —guilty of the awful crime of blowing up buildings and bridges with dynamite. In the specific case for which the McNamara brothers are now in the penitentiary, twenty-one lives were lost by the explosion of the office of the *Times* newspaper, at Los Angeles, Cal. The dynamiters professed to be acting in behalf of a trade union organization, their purpose being to punish and to terrorize the employers of non-union labor. At present writing it is undetermined to what extent the Trade Unions were officially responsible. It is proper to say that after the McNamara brothers had confessed, representative Labor leaders and many Trade Unions bitterly denounced the crime and the perpetrators. But it is also proper to say that many of these same leaders and organizations had vehemently and recklessly proclaimed the innocence of the murderers, although all the evidence in sight was plainly to the effect that there was at least grave reason to believe them guilty. This criticism also applies to the Socialists—who are always eager to applaud any outrage on person or property so long as it affords an opportunity to denounce "capitalists" or "capitalism" or the constituted authorities. The

plain truth is that a number of the principal Labor and Socialist leaders have incurred a fearful responsibility by stirring up class hatred and by rushing to the defence of men charged with outrages, if those charged happen to belong to Labor or Socialist organizations. Such a reprehensible attitude is the natural result—as has been shown recently in England as well as in America—of the "class-conscious" doctrine taught by Socialists and now unfortunately widely held by Trade Unionists. And yet the fact remains that the vast body of American Trade Unionists are law-abiding.

Present Outlook.

While Socialism in America has not yet reached the period of manhood in experience and wisdom, Trade Unionism in this country is comparatively in its old age as to policy and methods. The present relationship between Socialism and Trade Unionism in America is much like that which prevailed in England fifteen or twenty years ago. Socialism in England was nothing but a "cult" until it gobbled up Trade Unionism—or gently absorbed it by what Mr. Hardie unctuously styles an "alliance." Since then Socialism has become the most active—and certainly the noisiest—factor in British politics, and proportionately to its numerical strength, the most powerful group as represented in Parliament.

As the case stands at present, the majority of American Trade Unionists—and especially the most prominent and trusted leaders—are opposed to independent political activity as a general proposition, although there is an acceptance of the policy of aiding friends and punishing enemies by means of the ballot; and then apart

from this, it is probably true that the majority of American Trade Unionists are personally opposed to Socialism as a doctrine. But be this as it may, there can be no doubt that at present the majority sentiment of American Trade Unionists is opposed to an alliance with organized Socialism; still, there is a growing tendency to make common cause.

On the other hand, the prevailing sentiment among American Socialists seems to be one of opposition to any alliance with the Trade Unionists, or to a reorganization into a "Labor Party," similar to the rather complicated combination of that name which has recently been cutting such a wide swath in British political and Parliamentary affairs. There has been a discussion in the *International Socialist Review* (Chicago) as to the orthodoxy of the British Labor-Socialist Party, and particularly as to that of the originator of the organization, J. Keir Hardie, M. P. In summing up the case this organ of American Marxism expressed itself as follows, and there can be little doubt that it speaks with authority on this point:

> Whether the Labor Party of England is a benefit to the revolutionary movement of the world is a question which most concerns English Socialists and may safely be left to them. But whether the Socialist Party of America should encourage the formation of a Labor Party here and become a part of it, is a vital question to us. To this question the *Review's* answer is an emphatic NO. For the American Trade Unions to-day are as yet conservative rather than revolutionary. They are too much concerned with holding what little advantages skilled laborers still have over unskilled laborers, to realize that the important thing for the working class is to get control of the machinery of production and keep the full value of what they produce.

> So long as the Unions take this position, an alliance with them would be a denial of the revolutionary aims of the Socialist Party. It would be suicidal. It would show that we, as a party, deserved to die. It would put us on the scrap-heap, to be replaced by some new revolutionary party, made up of men with clearer heads and stiffer backbones.

However strong this argument may be from a Socialist standpoint, it seems clear from an independent survey that the Trade Unionists hold the key to the situation—that the American Socialist Party will never become a serious political force until it comes to some understanding with organized Labor. There are influences now at work, beyond the control of the present leaders of the two movements, which will very likely eventuate in a "coming together," although the precise form of the coalition may, and probably will, differ from that of the British Labor Party; for Socialism in America, in order to become a real, active power in politics, must abandon the pretense of "Internationalism," and must become American in characteristics of structure as an organization, as also in peculiarities of sentiment and aims.

A few years ago Prof. Werner Sombart, a well-known German Sociologist, came to America. On his return to Europe he published a work entitled "Why there is no Socialism in the United States," and he closed by saying:

> All the factors that have up to this time retarded the evolution of Socialism in the United States are on the point of vanishing, or of changing into their contraries, and, as a consequence, Socialism will, in all likelihood, during the next generation attain in the Union its highest development.

CHAPTER X

BRITISH SOCIALISM

The Most Active Force in England.

The most active political and the most potent economic force in England to-day is Socialism. It has passed the mere missionary and propaganda stage: it now does things, and makes "the most powerful government in British history" do things. It has permeated all classes of British society. There are not only "Socialists of the Chair" (University professors inclined to radical views), but there are Socialists of the drawing-room, and of the pulpit; there are organizations of Socialists in several departments of the public service, and also among the school teachers, and the women, and even in the medical professions; and, most remarkable of all, there are Socialist churches and Sunday-schools! And yet the present wide-sweeping Socialism of England, theoretical as well as practical, is distinctively a "class movement," avowedly for the special benefit of the manual workers—the "proletariat," as it is now proper to call them, according to Socialist nomenclature. The organized workers of Great Britain (this does not include Ireland) have become saturated with a belief that nearly all wealth represents so much plunder, stolen from them; that Labor can never secure the rewards to which it is entitled until all capital and

all productive enterprises, and also the land, are owned by the community; that it is the duty of the State to provide work, with short hours and big pay; and that if the State cannot find work under these conditions it is bound, at any rate, to see that everybody be given comfortable maintenance. It is very doubtful, however, whether there is any general intelligent appreciation among the British proletariat of the actual philosophy of genuine Marxian Socialism.

Although the Socialist vote in Great Britain is not nearly as large as it is in Germany, yet it has more direct and indirect influence in legislative matters than in the latter country. This is true not only of the national Parliaments of the two countries, but of municipal and other local bodies. The present British Liberal Government has passed more Socialistic legislation than any other Administration in British history has done; and for a period of years, until very recently, it seemed as if the British municipalities had plunged headlong into Socialism.

Characteristics.

There is a distinctive, national, British Socialism, notwithstanding the so-called "ultimate goal" of International Socialism (with which it has recently formally affiliated)—the Collective Commonwealth. The overwhelming majority of men who call themselves Socialists in Great Britain are Fabian Opportunists; and the Marxian, revolutionary, philosophical Socialists are a comparatively small and unimportant minority. The two schools do not get along very harmoniously. The difference between the two parties—for in one sense that is what they really are—is something like that between

the Socialist Party (of which Mr. Debs is the recognized head) and the Socialist Labor Party (of which Daniel de Leon is the head), in the United States—only the difference is more accentuated in Great Britain.

The prevailing school of British Socialism takes all it can get from organized society—that is, from the Imperial Parliament and the local legislative and administrative authorities. Its unwritten motto is, "Half a loaf is better than no bread;" and it prefers "frequent spoils and victories" to the "all-or-nothing" programme of the Marxian Strict Constructionists. But the British Socialists, much as they have got, are as dissatisfied as they were when they first started out on their crusade against the present "capitalistic system." For the time being they are willing to compromise, but they will not accept any compromise as a finality; and they agree, in an academic sense, with the Strict Constructionists, that the ultimate goal is the absolute destruction of not only Capitalism but of Individualism—at least, of Individualism as it is generally understood. The characteristic spirit of British Socialism is Compromise and Opportunism. It differs from the German, particularly, in that it lays little stress on rigid and hard-set formulas; and in this there is shown a characteristic difference between the British and the German peoples. The hard-and-fast Marxians of this country, as well as in Germany, and in England itself, often raise the question as to the orthodoxy of British Socialism; but the British people do not care much for *names* so long as they get the *things*.

Karl Kautsky, the editor of *Die Neue Zeitung* (the leading German Socialist review), and the successor of Engels as the compiler of the posthumous writings of

Karl Marx, appreciates what a powerful factor compromise is in social and economic evolution, for he says (*Ethics and Materialistic Conception of History*): "So it seems to be a general law of social development, that countries which are pioneers in the economic development are tempted to put compromise in the place of radical solutions."

Engels, with all his contempt for British "respectability" and conservatism, and his over-optimism as to the early establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth in his native Germany, recognized that the Englishman, although not a *doctrinaire,* generally gets that which he really wants in legislation. And, perhaps that is because of the very fact that he is not a *doctrinaire,* but only a practical Opportunist. In his introduction to *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific,* Engels says:

> . . . But for all that the English working class is moving, as even Professor Brentano has sorrowfully had to report to his brother Katheder-Socialists. It moves like all things in England, with a slow and measured step, with hesitation here, with more or less unfruitful, tentative attempts there; it moves now and then with an over-cautious mistrust of the name of Socialism, while *it gradually absorbs the substance;* and the movement spreads and seizes one layer of the workers after another. . . . And if the pace of the movement is not up to the impatience of some people, let them not forget that it is the working class which keeps alive the finest qualities of the English character, and that, *if a step in advance is once gained in England, it is, as a rule, never lost afterwards.*

The above was written in 1892, and since then there has been a marvellous development of Socialism among the English workingmen.

English Socialism has, therefore, been modified in accordance with the English temperament, as Brougham Villiers says in *The Socialist Movement in England.* It is true, also, as that brilliant writer remarks, that "the belief that Socialism was essentially un-English had become prevalent, and continued, until the Labor successes of 1906."

Socialism Essentially English in Origin.

Yet Socialism in all its forms but one, the Anarchistic, is really essentially English in origin—that is, it is more English than alien; and even though it is true that France contributed its genius to the conceptive idea of Utopian Christian and Scientific Socialism, yet the movement in England, along the same lines, was contemporaneous. More than any other countries, England and France are the birth-places of Modern Socialism; nevertheless, it has become the custom in both America and England to look upon Socialism as peculiarly—indeed, almost exclusively—a German institution, and as having come full-fledged from the brain of Karl Marx. But to Marx must be given the credit of making into a scientific formula the crude Collectivism of Owen, and of logically applying and carrying to their conclusions the economic principles as to Capital and Labor laid down by Locke, Adam Smith, Ricardo, Bray, Thompson, Hall, and others—all Britishers. Marx was five years old when Ricardo died, and it is noteworthy that they were both of the House of Israel. "Without Ricardo there would have been no Marx," declares the learned Prof. Flint; and he goes on to say: "The essential content of the Marxian economics is the Ricardian economics. Marx received Ricardo's exposition of eco-

nomics as generally correct, narrowed still further what was already too narrow in it, exaggerated what was excessive, and made applications of it which Ricardo had not foreseen." Thomas Kirkup (than whom there is no more reliable authority) says in his *History of Socialism,* speaking of the Chartist agitation of 1837-54: "As regards the study of Socialism, the interest of this movement lies greatly in the fact that in its organs the doctrine of 'surplus value,' afterwards elaborated by Marx as the basis of his system, is broadly and emphatically enunciated. While the worker produces all the wealth, he is obliged to content himself with the meagre share necessary to support his existence, and the surplus goes to the capitalist, who, with the king, the priests, lords, esquires, and gentlemen, lives upon the labor of the working man." (*Poor Man's Guardian,* 1835.) As Shakespeare did with history and romance, so did Marx with economics—he gathered from all sources; "his comprehensive head" absorbed, separated, analyzed, humanized, and scientifically systematized and elaborated the various and often diverse doctrines of universal economics—

> "Till, like great Jove, the leader, figuring in,
> Attunes to order the chaotic din."

And now the economists are tearing Marxism to pieces; even the Marxians are denying the "fundamentals!"

Marx himself can be cited as an authority that the economics he scientifically formulated were not German in origin. In his preface (written at London in January, 1873) to the second edition of *Capital,* he says:

"To the present moment Political Economy in Germany is a foreign science. . . . Thus the soil whence Political Economy springs was wanting. This 'science' had to be imported from England as a ready-made article; its German professors remained schoolboys."

John Spargo makes it plain that the founder of Modern Socialism was greatly indebted to the early English Economists and Socialists. In *Socialism* Spargo says:

> During the year 1845, when the history of the economic interpretation of history was absorbing his attention, Marx spent six weeks in England with his friend Engels, and became acquainted with the work of the Ricardian Socialists already referred to. Engels had been living in England about three years at this time, and had made an exhaustive investigation of industrial conditions there, and became intimately acquainted with the leaders of the Chartist movement. His fine library contained most of the works of contemporary writers, and it was thus that Marx came to know them.
>
> Foremost of this school of Socialists which had arisen, quite naturally, in the land where capitalism flourished at its best, were William Godwin, Charles Hall, William Thompson, John Gray, Thomas Hodgskin, and John Francis Bray. With the exception of Hall, of whose privately printed book, "The Effects of Civilization on the People of the European States," 1805, he seems not to have known, Marx was familiar with the writings of all the foregoing, and his obligations to some of them, especially Thompson, Hodgskin, and Bray, were not slight. . . . Godwin's most important work, "An Inquiry Concerning Political Justice," appeared in 1793, and contains the germ of much that is called Marxian Socialism. In it may be found the broad lines of thought which marks much of our present-day Socialist teaching, especially the criticism of capitalist society. . . . Thompson wrote several works of a Socialist character . . . [and] must be regarded as one of the greatest precursors of Marx in the development of modern Socialist theory. Marx never claimed to have originated the term ["surplus

> value"]. It is to be found in the writings of earlier economists than Thompson even. . . . Nor did Marx claim to be the first to distinguish surplus value. That had been done very clearly by many others, including Adam Smith. What is original in Marx is the explanation of the manner in which surplus value is produced.
>
> . . . The studious years spent in the reading room of the British Museum complete the anglicization of Marx. "Capital" is essentially an English work, the fact of its having been written in German, by a German writer, being merely incidental. No more distinctively English treatise on political economy was ever written, not even "The Wealth of Nations." Even the method and style of the book are, contrary to general opinion, much more distinctively English than German. . . . Marx belongs to the school of Petty, Smith, and Ricardo, and their work is the background of his. "Capital" was the child of English industrial conditions and English thought, born by chance upon German soil.

Spargo goes at length into this matter, not only for the purpose of demonstrating that Marxian Socialism is of English origin, but also to rebut the charge made by some critics that Marx stole the ideas with which his name is associated from the English Ricardians without acknowledgment. "As a matter of fact," says Spargo, "no economist of note ever quoted his authorities, or acknowledged his indebtedness to others, more generously than did Marx."

John Ball, the First English Socialist.

Brougham Villiers, in his *Socialist Movement in England,* agrees with Thorold Rogers (the noted statistician-economist), that wages and the general conditions of Labor, allowing for the price of food, were better in the Middle Ages than now; but this is a contention difficult to maintain. There was, in the Middle Ages, Vil-

liers claims, far more "organic Socialism in England than during the first three centuries of Protestantism." He says that these Socialist ideas, after being popular throughout Christendom for centuries, for a time passed out of the minds of men.

John Ball may be said to have been the first English Socialist, as the term is understood now. Thorold Rogers says that Ball preached Christian Socialism; but he also preached something very much like the "class-struggle," Revolutionary Socialism of Karl Marx, without its scientific basis. One very seldom, now-a-days, hears of John Ball, and yet Labor and Liberty owe him a vast debt. John Ball was known as "St. Mary's priest," and the land-owners called him "the mad priest of Kent." He became the eloquent champion of the historic "Peasants' Revolt" of 1381. John Richard Green, in his *History of the English People,* says that "in the preaching of John Ball England first listened to the knell of feudalism and the declaration of the rights of man." Here is a sample from his preaching, and it sounds wonderfully like an extract from a speech by a Modern Socialist orator:

> Good people, things will never be well in England so long as there be villeins [feudal serfs] and gentle folk. By what right are they whom we call lords greater folk than we? On what grounds have they deserved it? Why do they hold us in serfage? If we all came from the same father and mother, of Adam and Eve, how can they say or prove that they are better than we, if it be not that they make us gain for them by our toil what they spend in their pride? They are clothed in velvet, and warm in their furs and their ermines, while we are covered with rags. They have wine, spices and fine bread; we have only oat cake and straw and water to drink. They have leisure and fine houses; we have

pain and labor, the rain and the wind in the fields. And yet it is of our toil that these men hold their estate.

In 1348-1382 Asia and Europe were scourged with the awful "Black Death." It is said to have carried off 30,000,000 Europeans, and of the 4,000,000 which formed the population of England, more than half were swept away. At that time London had a population of 120,000, and 100,000 were carried off by the plague. The reduction in the population had a great deal to do with the abolition of serfdom in England. Labor was at a high premium, the price of food rose greatly, and strikes followed. Then came "The Peasants' Revolt" of 1381. The spirit of discontent was aggravated by a change in the "Statutes of Labor," fixing the price of labor at what it had been two years before the "Black Death," although the price of food had risen greatly. Still further was the discontent increased by the imposition of a poll-tax to pay the expenses of the war with France, the tax being the same for the poor as for the rich. The revolt of the peasants was led by Wat Tyler and Jack Straw. Ball had incited the people to revolt, and he was imprisoned, first in the jail at Maidstone, and then in the palace of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The populace at Canterbury were in sympathy with the movement, and they plundered the Archbishop's palace and released Ball. Headed by Ball and Tyler, the mob (for that is all it was) marched on to London, occupying several towns on the way. They entered London with the torch, and burned the palace of the powerful John of Gaunt, and the hospital of St. John; plate and jewelry were smashed and destroyed, but nothing was stolen. The King parleyed with them, and by diplo-

matic methods induced the rebels to lay down their arms and to return peaceably to their homes. While Tyler was holding converse with the King, under protection of a "safe conduct," he was treacherously stabbed to death by the Mayor of London, and that event brought about the collapse of the revolt of the peasants. John Ball attempted to rally them, but failed; and he was caught, hanged, drawn and quartered. Thus ended what is said to have been the only attempt of the peasants and artisans of England to effect a revolution by force.

This revolt, although ending so ignominously, was one of the most historic events in the whole history of the English people, both in its causes and in its permanent results. The times were rough and bloody; hence, the methods of Ball and Tyler are in many respects repugnant to our ideas of how a popular agitation for reform should be carried on. But it would be grossly unfair, as well as absurd, to judge these men by present-day ethics. After making due allowance, it cannot be denied that John Ball had at heart the true spirit of a reformer and of a lover of the oppressed.

William Morris, "poet, artist, and Socialist"—who, until he became a Socialist, confesses that he was only "the idle singer of an empty day"—has immortalized "the mad priest of Kent" in a prose-poem entitled "A Dream of John Ball."

The "Industrial Revolution" in England.

All authorities agree that the event, or rather development, which brought about the present Scientific Socialism, was what is called the "Industrial Revolution;" and, indeed, Socialists claim that it was the "Industrial

Revolution" which has made Socialism necessary. The introduction of machinery, the establishment of the factory system, and the "socialization" of labor—that is, the division of labor and the working in harmony of different groups of industrial laborers or artisans—was the "Industrial Revolution." This occurred at the close of the eighteenth century; and as England was then—and for some time afterwards—the "workshop of the world," it is natural that its effects, and particularly its bad features, should be seen first and with the greatest emphasis in that country.

The independent, individual workman, owning his own means of production, disappeared with the abolition of the guilds. There had been gradually growing up an industrial capitalist class; and the new system swept manufacturers into their hands. There came a new social order: On the one side Capitalism; on the other side Proletarianism; and as Morris and Bax put it in their joint work, "the workman, from being a machine, was to become the auxiliary of a machine." The beginning of the "Industrial Revolution" was contemporaneous with the invention of the spinning-jenny by Hargreaves in 1764; and "from thence to the utilization of steam as a motive force, and thence again to our own days, the stream of invention has been continuous." And concurrently with this stream has been an ever-increasing "socialization" of labor—and, therefore, according to the Socialist argument, an ever-increasing tendency to and necessity for Revolutionary Socialism—that is, for the collective ownership and operation by the State, or the community, of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

Accepting Modern Socialism as of British origin, it

may be said that its beginning was in 1817, when Robert Owen (then acting simply as a philanthropist) appeared before a committee of the British House of Commons, and presented a plan for a Socialistic community. Contemporaneously with this action of Owen, Saint-Simon in France had enunciated theories which are to be classed as Socialistic; and Fourier, as an Utopian, antedated both Owen and Saint-Simon; but for practical purposes, the beginning of Modern Socialism may be placed with the event in which Owen figured as above.

The condition of the British working classes at this time was terrible. Speaking of the period of the end of the eighteenth century, Villiers says: "Divorced, in the towns from all control over the machinery at which they worked, in the country from the soil, their guilds and clubs broken up, the feeble beginnings of Trade Unionism suppressed by law, ill-educated, over-worked and shamefully under-paid, the working people of England were practically outside of society altogether. . . . I know of no modern literature where the workingman counts for so little in life, where his inferiority in status is taken so much for granted, as that of the eighteenth century." When land became commercially valuable, the interest of the poor was taken away. Speaking of the invention of the steam engine, Thomas Kirkup calls James Watt "the greatest innovator and revolutionist the world has ever seen." But the revolution in Industrialism brought about by the invention of the steam engine did not benefit the workingman.

The "Luddites."

The "Industrial Revolution"—the "condition precedent" of Modern Socialism—was signalized in England

by dreadful distress among the artisan class and by outbreaks of popular fury, followed by stern action on the part of the authorities. "As we read the accounts of the distress which followed upon the introduction of the new mechanical inventions," observes John Spargo, in *Socialism*, "it is impossible to regard with surprise or with condemnatory feelings the riots of the misguided 'Luddites' who went about destroying machinery in their wild desperation." These outbreaks occurred in 1811-1813, and again in 1816. The real name of the leader was Mellor, but he called himself "General Lud," this name having been adopted by him from the circumstance that an imbecile named Ned Lud, living in a village in Leicestershire, on being tormented by some boys, pursued them into a factory, and broke two stocking-frames. Mellor, or "General Lud," led the artisans who endeavored to prevent the use of power-looms, which had recently been introduced for finishing woolen goods, formerly done by men called "croppers," who were thrown out of employment. So they organized themselves into bands, under "General Lud," and destroyed the machines. His chief abettors were called "Lud's wives," and his followers were called "Luddites;" and when any machinery was broken it became a common saying that Lud did it. The riots began in the winter of 1811, in Nottingham, and spread into Yorkshire and Lancashire. Parliament passed severe laws against the "Luddites," and it is notable that it was in opposition to this legislation that Byron made his first speech in the House of Lords. In 1816, following the European peace, there was fearful distress; the harvests were failures, and wheat rose to a guinea ($5) a bushel. Seditious riots broke out in Nottingham

and spread over almost the entire kingdom; and the rioters, who were well organized, made a specialty of destroying machinery. Partly through the return of "good times," and partly through the repressive measures adopted, the unrest quieted down. In the suppression of the "Luddites," sixty-four of them were executed in 1812, and also a number early in 1813.

The "Chartists."

Between 1837 and 1854 England was disturbed by an agitation known as "Chartism," which several times threatened to reach the dimensions of a national insursection. It was closely allied to Socialism, although some Socialist writers of the present day try to make it plain that Chartism was exclusively political in origin and objects, and should not be considered as in any way connected with the present philosophical evolutionary Socialism; but certainly Chartism must be considered as part of the general movement in England during the past century which has culminated in the present aggressive and enthusiastic Socialist organizations. Thomas Kirkup is not one of these Socialist writers who try to ignore or depreciate Chartism; he acknowledges (*History of Socialism*) that while it was most prominently a demand for political reform, yet that "both in its origin and in its ultimate aim the movement was more essentially economic."

Kirkup also says that the Chartists broadly and emphatically enunciated the doctrine of "surplus value," afterwards elaborated by Marx as the basis of his system. Engels, the great associate of Marx, sympathized with the Chartists,—he being in London at the time of the agitation—and he became very friendly with the

Chartist leaders, notably with Feargus O'Connor, the chief leader, and Engels contributed to his paper, the *Northern Star*. It was the Chartist movement, and the revelations incident thereto as to the condition of the working classes, which induced the establishment of the Christian Socialist movement by Maurice, Kingsley, and Ludlow; and after the downfall of Chartism, it was the old leaders of that agitation around whom centred for many years whatever force there was in the Socialist cause. In fact, it was Chartism which nurtured Socialism when the latter was in its swaddling clothes.

Chartism became active in 1838. The document in which the scheme of reform was set out was called the "People's Charter," or "National Charter;" hence, the name "Charterism," afterwards abbreviated to "Chartism." The origin of Chartism was the dissatisfaction of the working people with the Reform Bill of 1832, which, while of benefit to the middle classes, was not radical enough to reach below that stratum of society. In 1838 six of the more advanced members of the House of Commons held a conference with representatives of the Workingmen's Association of London, and the draft of a Bill to be introduced in Parliament was agreed upon, it being called "The People's Charter." The principal demands formulated in this Bill became famous under the name of "the six points" of Chartism, they being: (1) annual parliaments; (2) universal manhood suffrage; (3) vote by ballot; (4) abolition of the property qualification for membership in the House of Commons; (5) payment of members of Parliament; (6) equal electoral districts. The sincerity of some of the members of Parliament who took part in the organization of the movement has been questioned; it is, how-

ever, possible that the members referred to may have been sincere enough at the commencement, but afterwards became frightened at the fierceness which soon characterized the movement. The most influential of the six members of Parliament who helped to frame the "Charter" was the eloquent Irish agitator, the great "Liberator," Daniel O'Connell. It is said that O'Connell handed the Charter to the Secretary of the Workingmen's Association, William Lovett (a man of exceptional ability both as a writer and as an organizer), with these words: "There, Lovett, is your Charter; agitate for it, and never be content with anything less." Yet O'Connell abandoned the movement; indeed, he became a bitter opponent. Another Irishman, however, filled the place of O'Connell—Feargus O'Connor. He was an educated and eloquent man, but not a safe leader. O'Connor was elected to Parliament from Cork in 1832. Becoming estranged from O'Connell, he devoted his life to the cause of the workingmen of England, and he was one of the most fervent of their advocates. In 1847 Feargus O'Connor was elected to Parliament from Nottingham, England, a working-class constituency. Poor O'Connor became hopelessly insane in 1852, and died three years afterwards. Beatrice Potter, the wife of Sidney Webb, Trade Union and Socialist writer, is severe on O'Connor, in her book, *The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain.* She says that the Chartist movement drifted from under the leadership of honest and able workmen and "passed into the hands of an Irish political quack—Feargus O'Connor—who preached physical force without daring to use it, and precipitated his followers into riots and conspiracies for which they alone suffered." Another gifted leader of the move-

ment was Henry Vincent, who was called "the young Demosthenes of English Democracy." No other political reform movement, before or since, has ever taken such a passionate hold upon the English working classes as Chartism did; there has never been anything like it in the United Kingdom with the exception of the Fenian and similar organizations among the Irish. The organization of the movement spread rapidly, and monster meetings were held in the principal cities. At Glasgow, for instance, there was a meeting of 200,000 workingmen, and a report of it reads: "The very heavens rang with the lively strains of music and the shouts of the enthusiastic multitude. There were forty bands of music, and more than 200 flags and banners waved gracefully in the breeze." Still larger meetings were held at Birmingham and Manchester, afterwards; and at these and other meetings seditious language was used, and collisions occurred with the police. A favorite method of impressing the country with the strength of the movement was to present monster petitions to Parliament. It was discovered, however, that there was a practice of putting large numbers of fictitious names on these petitions, and this discovery naturally negatived much of the effect which they would otherwise have had. In February, 1839, a convention of the Chartists was held, and it then became prominent that there were two groups in the movement, one favoring peaceful, constitutional methods, and the other being avowedly a "physical-force" party. There were more collisions with the police, and several of the leaders were arrested at Birmingham, at which the mob retaliated by setting fire to property. On January 14, 1839, a petition was presented to Parliament bearing 1,280,000 names, but

it was rejected by a vote of 237 to 48, and this action of Parliament much embittered the Chartists. Henry Vincent and a number of other Chartists were imprisoned at Newport, Monmouthshire. On November 4th, 1839, there occurred at Newport what is known as "The Welsh Insurrection." It had been reported that the authorities were treating Vincent and the other imprisoned Chartists very harshly, and a number of work people of the district, with Chartist sympathies, marched on to the jail, probably with the wild idea of releasing the prisoners. On the way a company of soldiers was encountered; the mob fired some shots at them; the latter returned the fire, with the result that ten of the mob were killed and a large number wounded. Some of the leaders of the mob were arrested, and tried and condemned for high treason, and three of them were sentenced to death, but their sentences were commuted and they were transported. In 1840 there was formed at Manchester the National Charter Association, which soon became the head of 400 branches. A land scheme was started by O'Connor, but it failed after a few years; in 1844 O'Connor made himself prominent by opposing the Anti-Corn Law League, and he entered into a public controversy with Cobden and Bright.

In 1848 came the culmination of the Chartist movement. There was terrible suffering among the working people of the Kingdom, and they were in a receptive mood to absorb the spirit of revolt from their comrades of the French capital. There was a renewal of the Chartist agitation, accompanied by some disorder. An enormous demonstration was arranged for April 10th at Kennington, London. It was expected that there would be half a million people present, and it was planned to

march to the Houses of Parliament, and present a monster petition in favor of the "six points" of the Chartist programme, it being claimed that this petition was signed by 5,700,000 people. Warned by the events at Paris, the British authorities determined to take no chances. The situation was placed in the hands of the Duke of Wellington; and the measures he adopted were not only ample for any extreme contingency, but were distinguished by great wisdom. He so arranged his troops that their presence would not be an inciting cause for violence, but at the same time they were ready for instant action; and the military were reinforced by a civilian contingent of special constables, variously numbered at from 170,000 to over 200,000. The authorities permitted the meeting to be held at Kennington Common, but forbade the contemplated procession to the Houses of Parliament. On the preceding evening Maurice, "the Chartist parson," and the joint-founder with Kingsley of English Christian Socialism, issued an eloquent and impassioned appeal to the Chartists, as free and liberty-loving Englishmen, not to stain their cause with bloodshed and violence; and to the tremendous relief of everybody the affair passed off peacefully. Instead of there being half a million persons at the meeting, there were only one-tenth that many; and the proposed procession to Parliament was abandoned, the Chartist leaders deeming it dangerous to defy the authorities in that regard. It took three cabs to convey the petition to Parliament. Feargus O'Connor presented it; but instead of there being 5,700,000 names on it, as claimed by O'Connor, there were only 1,975,496, and a large number of these were fictitious, many of the names being clumsy forgeries, such as "Victoria Rex," the

"Duke of Wellington," and "Sir Robert Peel;" and a large number of the signatures were ridiculous, such as "Pugnose," "Longnose," "Flatnose," "Punch," etc. This fiasco was speedily followed by the collapse of the Chartist movement.

There has been much discussion as to the value of the Chartist agitation in improving the condition of the work people. The general view—and probably the correct one—is, that while there was no definite, direct beneficial result, yet that indirectly it led to ameliorative legislation, and caused thoughtful men to give more earnest consideration to the just demands of the work people; and then it was a lesson in organization to the work people themselves. The extreme discontent of the wage earners was removed for the time being by the inauguration of national prosperity; and subsequently several of "the six points" were granted. The vote by ballot was given in 1872; a reformation of the electoral districts was made in 1884-5; and the franchise has been much extended; and at the present writing (January, 1912) manhood suffrage is in sight.

The "International" in England.

In March, 1909, the Rev. Bernard Vaughan, the famous Jesuit priest, delivered a lecture in London, under the title, "Socialism; Is It Liberty or Tyranny?" His concluding sentence was as follows: "Fellow countrymen and patriots, build up character, hold your own, and send Socialism back to the place whence first it came—Germany!" The eloquent father may be perfectly at home in disclaiming on his favorite topic, "Sins of Society," but evidently he is not well posted in the history of Socialism. As is shown elsewhere in this

volume, Socialism is a British rather than a German product.

There is a sense, however, in which Socialism was "made in Germany." After the conception of and fading away of Utopian Socialism in England, and the enunciation of the economic basis of Modern Socialism as absorbed and scientifically shaped by Marx, there was a period of rest in England in the development of Socialism. "Gradually," says Villiers, "the centre of interest shifted to Germany, in which land the Socialist idea made, for a long time, most progress, and where Socialism was armed with intellectual and political weapons fitted to the needs of the age." Villiers proceeds to show that the earlier English Socialists "allowed even more than its due importance to voluntary association, and but little to State action." This, however, he argues, does not, even from the standpoint of the modern Socialist, throw any doubt upon their orthodoxy, for "the aim of Socialism is to secure co-operation based on the common ownership of land and capital, and the particular manner in which this is attained, by State or voluntary action, or by both combined, is, however important, a matter of machinery, not of principle."

Although the marked development of and leadership in Socialism by the Germans is of a later period, yet the influence of German thought upon British and world-wide Socialism began to be exercised as early as 1836, when some German exiles in Paris formed a secret Communistic society called the "League of the Just." Owing to their complicity in a rising in Paris in 1839, they fled to London, where they met comrades of like speech, and they commenced an international propaganda. They

first called their association the *Deutscher Arbeiter-Bildungsverein*, and afterwards the Society of the Fraternal Democrats, their aim being to unite the Democracies of all nationalities. The original basis of the League was a sentimental Communism, based on their motto that "all men are brothers." The philosophy of Marx in due time moulded the views of the League, and in 1847, through his influence, these exiles held a Congress in London, and reorganized under the name of the Communist League. In 1848, acting on behalf of this League, Marx and Engels issued the famous *Communist Manifesto*. This document may be described as the "Advance Herald" of Marx's *Capital*. In his preface to subsequent editions of the *Manifesto*, Engels says: "Drawn up in German, in January, 1848, the manuscript was sent to the printer in London a few weeks before the French revolution of February 24th. A French translation was brought out in Paris, shortly before the insurrection of June, 1848. The first English translation, by Miss Helen Macfarlane, appeared in George Julian Harney's *Red Republican*, London, 1850." As to the League itself, in the form of the organization under the auspices of which the *Manifesto* was brought out, Engels, in the preface, has this to say: "Wherever independent proletarian movements continued to show life, they were ruthlessly hunted down. Thus the Prussian police hunted out the Central Board of the Communist League, then located in Cologne. The members were arrested, and, after eighteen months' imprisonment, they were tried in October, 1852. This celebrated 'Cologne Communist trial' lasted from October 4th till November 12th; seven of the prisoners were sentenced to terms of imprisonment in a fortress, vary-

ing from three to six years. Immediately after the sentence the League was formally dissolved by the remaining members. As to the 'Manifesto,' it seemed thenceforth to be doomed to oblivion."

The "International" sprang from the above movement, which for several years seems to have lain dormant. But in 1862 some French workmen visited London to see the International Exhibition, and there was an exchange of ideas among the comrades. This led to a meeting held in London, at St. Martin's Hall, September 28th, 1863. The chair was occupied by Prof. Edward Spencer Beesley, the famous Positivist author and radical social reformer, who in 1868 was made an honorary member of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, in recognition of his labors in securing the removal of laws unjust to Trade Unionists. The "International" was organized at this convention. Englishmen were elected as President, Secretary, and Treasurer of the General Council, and Corresponding Secretaries were elected for the different affiliated countries, Marx being chosen for Germany. A draft constitution was prepared, and it was confirmed afterwards, at the first Congress of the "International," at Geneva, in 1866. At the London meeting an address setting forth the objects of the movement was drawn up, the title of the organization being "The International Workingmen's Association." This address claimed that all recent revolutions and reforms had been in the interest of the middle classes, with no resultant improvement of the condition of the working classes; that the workingmen must emancipate themselves; and that the "International" was designed to be a centre of common action for the complete deliverance of the

workingmen of the world, without distinction of creed, nationality or color, from the tyranny of capital. The "International" stood for different things in different countries, and when it became "continentalized," and revolutionary, and permeated with Socialism of the most extreme materialistic doctrines, it lost all influence in England. Its history is not a notable one, the principal incident in its brief career being the struggle for supremacy between Marx and Bakounin, the Russian Nihilist. Marx won, but that was practically the end of the "International."

The Social Democratic Federation.

With the practical renunciation of the "International" by the English workingmen on account of its materialistic aims and revolutionary methods, and with their absorbed interest in Co-operation and Trade Unionism, it seemed as if Socialism had been put away permanently. But the fact was that the ground was only being prepared for a renewed, a second and a stronger growth. While Co-operation and Trade Unionism were receiving the attention of the working classes, and disciplining them for the contest soon to come, the "intellectuals" of the political Radicals were having developed among them a mental receptiveness for the doctrines of Marxian Socialism. The theories of Henry George had taken deep root in the English mind, among all classes —much more so than in his native country. Gladstone's policy in both Ireland and Egypt was very obnoxious to the Radical element in the Liberal Party; and the leaven of dissatisfaction with orthodox politics and economics was at work. Yet for years there was no public indication of the existence of any Socialist sentiment in Eng-

land except among the foreign refugees in the Soho district of London. Karl Marx, who from his long residence in England, ought to have thoroughly understood the English people, several times told Henry Mayers Hyndman (the most active English Socialist of the time) that he despaired "of any great movement in England, unless in response to some violent impetus from without." A leading member of the defunct and discredited "International," Eugene Dupont, said: "The English possess all the materials necessary for the social revolution; but they lack the generalizing spirit and the revolutionary passion."

But finally a start was made in 1881, by an attempt to unite the Radical clubs of London under the name of the Democratic Federation. Its direct aim was to secure the passage of measures of Radical reform, including land nationalization; and real, genuine, Marxian, Revolutionary Socialism became an organized fact two years afterwards, within the Federation.

There are different accounts as to how this revival of Socialism first made itself manifest. It is generally definitely ascribed to the action of the Democratic Federation, in 1884, in declaring for Socialism, and at the same time changing its name to the Social Democratic Federation. But Rae, in *Contemporary Socialism,* says that "in 1883 a Socialist movement seemed to break out spontaneously in England, the air hummed for a season with a multifarious social agitation, and we soon had a fairly complete equipment of Socialist organizations—social democratic, anarchist, dilettante—which have ever since kept up a busy movement with newspapers, lectures, debates, speeches, and demonstrations in the streets."

Whether this movement was the result of a deliberate plan of the leading spirits of the original Democratic Federation, formed in 1881, or whether it broke out spontaneously, as suggested by Rae, there can be no doubt as to the establishment of Revolutionary Socialism in England at last; and there was another fact of which there can be no doubt, viz., that the form in which it came was a German importation: Socialism had come back to the land of its birth, but it had come with a new inspiration, and in new habiliments. There are those who insist that this new "Scientific, Revolutionary" Socialism, as hammered out by the German Jew, Karl Marx, in London, from crude raw material which was principally English in origin, and which had been tempered and refined in a scientific manner in Germany, is "the last word" in the expression of Socialism or Economic Reform. But this view has not been accepted to any great extent in England, and it is getting to be less and less the prevailing view throughout the world.

The Social Democratic Federation is the oldest Socialist organization in England, with the exception of the Guild of St. Matthew, a Church of England Christian Socialist body, founded in 1877. When the Federation was first organized it flung the flag of uncompromising Marxian Socialism to the breeze; that "flag is still there," and the historic policy of the Federation has been one of "close communion"—of frigid non-intercourse with heterodox "Opportunists." There have been few intellectual or economic movements inaugurated anywhere by such a brilliant company of men and women as that which took part in the organization and early career of the Social Democratic Federation. At their head was Henry Mayers Hyndman, who after

the lapse of nearly thirty years continues his premier position in the leadership of the Marxian forces in England. Hyndman has had a remarkable career. After taking his degree at Oxford, in 1864, and studying law, he went through the Italian campaign of 1866 as correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. He became an authority on and acrid critic of Indian affairs; was a fiery opponent of Gladstone's "coercion policy" in Ireland; and in 1886 he was tried with John Burns (now a member of the British Cabinet) and several others for "uttering sedition and inciting to violence" in a speech to the unemployed in Trafalgar Square, London; but after a trial lasting three days they were all acquitted. During the political agitation of 1909 he became prominent in uniting himself with Robert Blatchford, the editor of the Socialist *Clarion*, in urging the British people to prepare themselves to withstand an invasion from Germany—not that he thinks the German people themselves want to take England, but that this, as he believes, is the life-ambition of the young German Emperor and of the bureaucrats surrounding him. Associated with Hyndman in organizing the Social Democratic Federation were the famous Positivist, Prof. Beesley (who had presided at the organization of the "International"); Joseph Cowen, M. P., the friend of Mazzini and Garibaldi; Helen Taylor, the niece of John Stuart Mill; Belfort Bax, probably the most incisive and philosophical writer on Socialism, from the Marxian standpoint, England has ever produced; and Dr. Aveling, a popular writer and lecturer, but best known as the son-in-law of Karl Marx. Others who early joined the Social Democratic Federation were William Morris, the wonderfully gifted poet and artist—claimed by

some to be the greatest intellect ever associated with Socialism; John Burns, the most prominent British labor agitator of the century, but now repudiated by his old comrades—at least by the noisiest and least responsible of them—because of his acceptance of a Cabinet position under the present Liberal Administration; Bernard Shaw, the famous playwright and professional cynic, who subsequently seceded from the Federation and became the leader of the Fabians, or Opportunists; Sidney Webb, the greatest living authority on Trade Unionism, and the author of a standard work on Socialism, and now also a Fabian; Sir Sydney Olivier, now the Governor of Jamaica, and said to be the first avowed Socialist to receive a responsible appointment from the British Crown; the Rev. Stewart Headlam, a "Catholic" High Anglican Churchman, and founder of the oldest British Socialist society, the Guild of St. Matthew, who is now classed as a Fabian; Tom Mann, a noted Labor leader, afterwards at the head of the Socialist movement of Australia, but who returned to England and was at the forefront in the violent Labor outbreak in 1911; and Mrs. Annie Besant, the brilliant but erratic agnostic and literary associate of the greatest Radical in England (but a strong anti-Socialist), Charles Bradlaugh. The organ of the Federation is *Justice,* the editor of which, Henry Quelch, is one of the most extreme Revolutionary Socialists in England. The Federation also has two monthly reviews, the *Social Democrat,* and *To-Day.*

The Social Democratic Federation (latterly sometimes called the Social Democratic Party) is the most radical organization of standing, politically and economically, in Great Britain; it is often designated as the

"S. D. F.," and its object is officially stated to be as follows:

> The socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, to be controlled by a democratic state in the interests of the entire community, and the complete emancipation of labor from the domination of capitalism and landlordism, with the establishment of social and economic equality between the sexes.

The following are among the "immediate reforms" demanded:

Abolition of the Monarchy;
Abolition of the House of Lords;
Payment of members of Parliament;
Adult suffrage;
Proportional representation;
Second ballot;
Initiative and Referendum;
Repudiation of the National Debt;
Abolition of all indirect taxation, and the institution of a cumulative tax on all incomes and inheritances exceeding three hundred pounds;
Free and compulsory education up to 16 years of age;
Land nationalization; and nationalization of the trusts, railways, docks, canals, and all great means of transit;
Public ownership and control of gas, electric light, water supplies, tramways [street cars], omnibus, and other locomotive services; of the food and coal supply, the lifeboat service, hospitals, dispensaries, cemeteries, and crematoria, and the drink traffic; and the establishment of State and municipal banks, pawnshops, and public restaurants;
Eight-hour working day, as a maximum;
Freedom of labor combinations;
No employment of children under 16 years of age;
Public provision of work at trade union rates;
Free State insurance, and State pensions for the aged or disabled;

A minimum wage of thirty shillings a week; equal pay for both sexes;
Public dwellings for the people at cost, without counting the cost of the land;
Free administration of justice, and free legal advice;
Disestablishment and disendowment of all State churches;
Abolition of standing armies, and establishment of national citizen forces, the people to decide on peace and war.

Sidney Webb, who was one of the early members, thus describes the Social Democratic Federation, in his book specially written for American readers, *Socialism in England:*

> In economics it professes to follow Karl Marx; in politics it is "Collectivist" as well as extremely democratic, and is marked by a tone of bitter repudiation of both liberal and conservative politicians. It denounces especially the "Conservatism" of the trades union leaders, and the working members of Parliament, as well as the "Jingo" foreign policy carried on by both great parties in the interests of capitalists and the aristocracy.

The Social Democratic Federation has not made much of an impression upon English public life. Of recent years it has entered the political field, but it has not attracted many votes. Foreign observers who have measured the Socialist situation in England by these results, and do not understand the complications of the English Labor-Socialist alliance, have not properly estimated the strength of the general movement. The fact is, the "S. D. F." is too "Marxian" for British conditions and British habits of thought and British national characteristics. Mr. Hyndman is evidently of Teutonic origin; it is certain he has the Teutonic philosophical and logical temperament, rather than the British prac-

tical spirit of Opportunism. He and the organization to which he has devoted his life have adopted the German expression of Socialism; but that expression does not appeal to any great number of Englishmen.

So, it is not to be wondered at that, although it is the second oldest of the Socialist organizations of Great Britain, the "S. D. F." does not cut much of a figure in actual political results, high intellectually though its literary advocates are. In 1906 the Federation polled only 29,810 votes, in a general election, electing one member of Parliament—Will Thorne, in West Ham, one of the poorest districts of London. In 1907, it elected another member, Victor Grayson, in a famous "bye" election in Colne Valley, a mining district of Yorkshire. Mr. Grayson was "suspended from the service of the House" for boisterous conduct and refusing to obey the order of the Speaker; and it is significant that although his conduct was avowedly based on the well-intentioned determination to force the attention of the Government to the deplorable condition of the unemployed, yet it did not receive the support of the Labor-Socialists. The report of the "S. D. F." for the year ending March, 1907, gave the number of branches and affiliated societies at 186; and in that year it had about 120 adherents who were members of various elected bodies, although probably a majority were elected independently of their Socialist views.

At the annual conference held in 1908, a proposal that the Federation should join the Labor Party in view of the fact that the latter had declared that its ultimate object was the realization of Socialism, was rejected by 130 to 30 votes. Mr. Quelch declared in *Justice* that the Labor Party was "undemocratic in character," and

he objected to a Socialist Party "being tied to the heels of a non-Socialist Party."

At this conference the following resolution, offered by Mr. Quelch, was carried without opposition: . .

> That in view of the efforts of enemies of Socialism to create division and prejudice in the ranks of the workers by raising sectarian disputes, this conference definitely reaffirms the position always maintained by the International Social Democracy, that the Socialist movement is concerned solely with secular affairs, and regards religion as a private matter.

At the twenty-eighth conference of the Social Democratic Party (as it now seems to prefer to be called), held in August, 1908, there were present 140 delegates, representing 112 branches and two affiliated societies. The organization is strongest in London, where the headquarters are situated. During the year 57 new branches had been added; there are 13 "Socialist Circles" for women affiliated with the party; and the total number of the branches at the commencement of 1909 is given as about 250.

Villiers claims that the first and greatest of the men who were instrumental in shaping the German-Marxian Socialism of the Social Democratic Federation into something more in keeping with English ideas was William Morris, the poet and artist. The resignation of Morris from the Federation and the founding by him of a rival organization, The Socialist League, is given as evidence of this recognition by him of the necessity of "Anglicizing" the movement. But the League was just as "un-English" as the Federation. There were personal reasons which influenced Morris in withdraw-

ing from the Federation; but he was also opposed to the methods of the Federation in advancing the Socialist cause. The League acknowledged the Collectivist principle as to the public control of the instruments of production and distribution, but it also accepted the philosophic-Anarchist doctrine that the control should be by free communal groups. The organ of the League was the *Commonweal,* which was edited by Morris. The League did not have much influence, and it soon went out of existence. While Morris had leanings to philosophic-Anarchism, he was not a revolutionary Anarchist, and when the League showed tendencies in the latter direction, he withdrew from it. After the collapse of the League, Morris identified himself with its successor, the Hammersmith Socialist Society. A prominent member of the Socialist League was Bruce Glasier, now well known as the editor of the *Labor-Leader,* the organ of the Independent Labor Party.

"Fabianism."

Probably the most widely-known of all Socialist organizations throughout the world is that of the English Fabians; and, politics aside, it has undoubtedly done more to influence intellectual opinion throughout the world—but particularly in England and America—in favor of Socialism, than any other agency or association. And yet it is not a large organization, its total membership in 1908 being less than 3,000, about 2,500 of whom belonged to the parent society in London. There are branches in the principal British cities, and several affiliated university societies. The Fabians in 1910 had 11 members in the House of Commons—5 sitting as Liberals, and 6 as members of the Labor Party. The

leading living Fabian is the well-known playwright, G. Bernard Shaw. He claims (preface to 1908 edition of *Fabian Essays*) that: "Since 1889 the Socialist movement has been completely transformed throughout Europe; and the result of the transformation may fairly be described as Fabian Socialism." This is unquestionably true so far as England is concerned; but as to the Continent, a denial would be entered by the German Marxists, although even in Germany there is an increasing tendency to adopt Fabian Opportunism.

Strange to say, it was an American who started the ball to roll which ended in the formation of the Fabian Society, his name being Thomas Davidson, of New York. He happened to be in London in the autumn of 1883, when there was a great deal of talk about Socialism, growing out of the English campaign of Henry George and the pending organization of the Social Democratic Federation. Under the leadership of Mr. Davidson a series of meetings of an informal nature were held, at which social questions were discussed. An organization called the "New Fellowship" was formed, and a quarterly journal named *Seedtime* was published. The members of the "New Fellowship" laid supreme stress on the need for ethical and spiritual changes as constant factors in the social movement, while others associated with them in the conferences called by Mr. Davidson favored the social and political changes demanded by the Social Democratic Federation, to be brought about gradually, however, as opportunity offered. It was this latter group who organized the far-famed Fabian Society.

The Fabians may be described as "Intellectual Opportunists." One of the founders of the society, the

late William Clarke, M. A. (and one of the writers of the well-known *Fabian Essays*), has explained that the Fabians propose to "conquer by delay." The Roman General, Quintus Fabius Maximus, was adopted as the patron saint of the society. The following is the motto of the Fabians: "For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did, most patiently, when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays; but when the time comes you must strike hard, as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain and fruitless." This double policy, then, as Clarke says, of waiting and striking, is the general idea of the society. It is now generally recognized in England by the anti-Socialists, that through this policy, and because of the fact that it is being backed up by greater intellectual activity and adroiter diplomacy than are engaged in any other economic or political organization in existence, anywhere (with the possible exception of the German Social Democracy), the Fabians have become the most dangerous of all the various groups of Socialists; and, at the same time, they are the most suave and "respectable."

As to the basis of the Fabian Society, the following is taken from the official statement:

> The Fabian Society consists of Socialists.
>
> It therefore aims at the reorganization of Society by the emancipation of Land and Industrial Capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. . . .
>
> The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land and the consequent individual appropriation in the form of Rent, of the price paid for permission to use the earth as well as for the advantages of superior soils and sites.

> The Society further works for the transfer to the community of the administration of such Industrial Capital as can conveniently be managed socially.

The Fabian Society was so called to distinguish it in the beginning from the only Socialism that existed in England in the early eighties—a wild, red revolutionary Socialism which sought to stir up the proletariat to a violent insurrection. The word "Fabian" has passed into the English language as a synonym for "cautiousness." A Fabian policy is a cautious policy. The effort has been to make people understand that Fabian Socialism is of a kind which is thoughtful, brainy, and responsible; the name is admitted to be rather whimsical, but its intention is plain, and the English people have now fairly grasped its significance.

Fabians aim at State, National, and Municipal ownership and control of land and capital, and they consider it better to socialize a part of the land or capital for the benefit of all, than to socialize everything in a given small area for the benefit of a few. That is why the Fabians, while being Opportunists, are not cordial to Communistic experiments, or even to Co-operation, for, in their view, the communals or co-operators really became a close corporation of proprietors holding against the main body of the people.

The Independent Labor Party.

Fabianism breathed the breath of life into the coldly philosophical materialism of Marxian Socialism, and substituted gradual, practical, every-day experience and ameliorative changes in public matters and social affairs for the vision of a dimly-distant revolutionary Collective Commonwealth. But, there was yet an ele-

ment wanting; and Trade Unionism supplied it. The Independent Labor Party, and especially the Labor Party, became the fighting-force of British Socialism. Until Labor, with its good, strong right arm, "took up" Socialism, it was little more effective or to be feared than—say Theosophy!

During a visit to Canada a few years ago, Keir Hardie, the Labor-Socialist Member of Parliament, is reported to have said, in reply to a question, "There is no class struggle." And yet, the Independent Labor Party, of which he was the founder, was organized primarily because of a controversy growing out of a "class struggle." The immediate occasion of its formation was a strike at Bradford, the capitalists, both Conservatives and Liberals, uniting to defeat the men. As a consequence, the men decided to start independent political action; a conference was called, and the Independent Labor Party was founded. At first, the controversy was merely a clash between Capital and Labor, but very soon Socialism as a definite issue became the cardinal principle of the organization.

It has been remarked that although Scotland is a democratic country—indeed, in a political sense, it is more so than England—yet, until recently, it has not been prominent in social reform. Even at the present time Socialism proper has not made nearly as much headway in Scotland as it has in England, although some of the Socialist leaders in England are Scotchmen—as, for instance, Keir Hardie himself, and the intellectual leader of Labor-Socialism, Ramsay Macdonald. But Scotland led England in actual Labor-Socialist organization. The pioneer avowedly Socialist organization in Scotland was the Land and Labor

League, founded in Edinburgh in 1883. The Social Democratic League and the Socialist League shortly afterwards established branches in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and a few other towns. The President of the Miners' Union was a remarkable young man named James Keir Hardie. When he was only eight years old he went to work in a mine as doorkeeper, and he worked in the mines until he was twenty-three years of age. A trouble arose with the mine owners, and young Hardie came to the front as leader, and was elected Secretary of the Union, and afterwards President. In 1888 he founded the Scottish Labor Party, which thus became the forerunner of the Independent Labor Party of Great Britain. The same year Keir Hardie ran as a Socialist candidate for Parliament in Mid-Lanark, but was defeated. He now represents a Welsh constituency, Merthyr Tydfil, although he is often spoken of as "the Member for the Unemployed."

At the Labor conference held at Bradford, in 1893, Keir Hardie took a prominent part, and it was largely through his efforts that the Independent Labor Party was formed. From the first, the organization was Socialist, although the word "Socialist" was not incorporated in the name. In 1894 the constitution was amended, and its object was declared to be "the Collective ownership and control of the means of production, distribution, and exchange."

The official statement (1909) of the programme and demands of the Independent Labor Party is as follows:

Object.

An Industrial Commonwealth founded upon the socialization of land and capital.

Methods.

The education of the community in the principles of Socialism;

The industrial and political organization of the workers;

The independent representation of Socialist principles in all elective bodies.

Programme.

The true object of industry being the production of the requirements of life, the responsibility should rest with the community collectively; therefore:

The land, being the storehouse of all the necessaries of life, should be declared and treated as public property;

The capital necessary for industrial operations should be owned and used collectively.

Demands.

As a means to this end, the Independent Labor Party demands the enactment of the following measures [summarized]:

A forty-eight hours' working week;

Provisions of work, at trade union rates, with a minimum of sixpence [12 cents] per hour;

Parish, district, borough, and county councils to be invested with powers to organize and undertake such industries as they may consider desirable: to compulsorily acquire land; to purchase, erect, or manufacture buildings, stock, or other articles for carrying on such industries; to levy rates on the rental values of the district, and borrow money on the security of such rates for any of the above purposes;

State pensions for every person over 50 years of age, and adequate provision for all widows, orphans, sick, and disabled workers;

Free secular, moral, primary, secondary, and university education, with free maintenance while at school or university;

Raising of the age of child labor;

Municipalization and public control of the drink traffic;

Municipalization and public control of all hospitals and infirmaries;

Abolition of indirect taxation and the gradual transference of all public burdens on to unearned incomes with a view to their ultimate extinction;

Adult suffrage; equal rights to women with men; triennial parliaments; and second ballot.

In 1895 the party had 28 Parliamentary candidates in the field, but it did not elect any; it polled altogether 44,321 votes.

In 1900, at the general election (called the "Khaki" election, on account of the Boer War being an issue), there were 10 Parliamentary seats contested, but only one candidate was elected—J. Keir Hardie, for Merthyr Tydfil. On a straight-out Socialist and anti-war platform, the party as a whole polled 37,209 votes.

At the General Election of 1906 (when the present Liberal Government secured power, with the largest party majority in modern times) the Independent Labor Party worked in conjunction with the Labor Representation Committee (now the Labor Party). Thus working in alliance, the Independent Labor Party nominated 10 Parliamentary candidates, and elected 7; and of the thirty members of the Labor Party who were elected as such, 11 of them were also members of the Independent Labor Party. Through its various groups and alliances, the Socialist-Labor Party controlled 55 votes in Parliament.

In August, 1907, the Independent Labor Party had over 700 branches, of which 155 had been formed in the preceding six months. In 1908, the organization had 765 branches. The total paying-membership was then estimated at over 40,000, and its income and expenditure at £100,000.

The Independent Labor Party had in 1909 about

900 representatives on town, county, district, and other local governing bodies.

The organ of the Party is the *Labor Leader,* founded and formerly edited by Keir Hardie, but now edited by J. Bruce Glasier, who was one of the first to identify himself with definite Socialism in Great Britain. Glasier was one of the founders of the Scotch Social Democratic Federation, and was one of the contributors to Morris's *Commonweal.*

The Labor Party.

Even in England there is much confusion with regard to the composition of British Socialism, and especially as to the Labor-Socialists:—as to the identity of the different organizations, their relationship to each other, and as to the relationship of the Socialist organizations as a whole to Trade Unionism as a separate movement; and this confusion applies particularly to the connection between Socialism and Labor in the House of Commons. It is not to be wondered at that foreign students of Socialism are bewildered over the complications of the relationship between these various organizations. This confusion is increased by the similarity of names of the Independent Labor Party and the Labor Party (the latter until lately being known as the Parliamentary Labor Representation Committee). The consequence is that there is a failure on the Continent and in America to understand adequately or to appreciate fully the development and the present status of British Socialism. Of the American writers on Socialism Robert Hunter is one of the few who clearly understand the situation as to both the peculiar relationship existing between the different Socialist and Labor

organizations to each other, and the methods and the spirit of present-day militant British Socialism.

The Labor Party is not really a Party at all, and the name is a misnomer. It is a Federation of organizations to secure the election of Labor members of Parliament, and the enactment of laws favorable to Labor. Yet, as an organization, it has no political or economic programme; it is not by name Socialist, but it is the most important Socialist political force in England to-day.

The fundamental idea of the so-called Labor Party was not originally Socialism—and is not now—but the direct representation of Labor in Parliament. As long back as 1874 there were thirteen candidates for election as direct representatives of Labor in Parliament, and two of these were successful. In 1892, at the General election, there were other Labor successes, among those elected being John Burns, one of the most famous of the Trade Union leaders, and now one of the most disliked men living, on the part of many of his former comrades, partly because he has since told them some plain but unwelcome truths, but principally because of a mean, petty spirit of proscription and jealousy on their part, he deeming it not beneath his dignity and honor as a workingman and a British subject to take office in the present Government, where he has labored unceasingly to benefit the class to which he belongs. Without unfairness it can be charged that narrow-minded intolerance is a characteristic of professional Socialists, not only in England but generally.

The Labor Representation Committee (now the Labor Party) was formed in 1900. It was, and is now, a political committee composed of representatives of Trade Unions and Socialist societies, to indorse and

support the candidates nominated by its constituent Unions and societies. The organization definitely originated at the Trade Union Congress held at Plymouth, in 1899, when a resolution was adopted calling for a conference of Trade Union, Co-operative, Socialistic, and other working-class organizations to consider Labor-political representation. This conference was held in London, February 20-28, 1900, societies being represented with a membership of nearly 600,000, of which all were Trade Unionists with the exception of 22,861, who were designated as Socialists. At this conference a Labor Representation Committee was formed; since then annual conferences have been held; and at the conference in 1906 the name was changed to that of the Labor Party.

Constitution and Organization.

"The Labor Party is a Federation consisting of Trades Unions, Trades Councils, Socialist Societies, and Local Labor Parties. Co-operative Societies are also eligible.

1. Candidates and members must accept this constitution; agree to abide by the decisions of the Parliamentary Party in carrying out the aims of this Constitution; appear before their constituencies under the title of Labor Candidates only; abstain strictly from identifying themselves with or promoting the interests of any party not eligible for affiliation; and they must not oppose any Candidate recognized by the Executive Committee of the Party.

2. Candidates must undertake to join the Parliamentary Labor Party, if elected.

Formerly the Trade Unions and Socialist and other organizations affiliated with the Labor Party were assessed to pay political expenses and the salaries of their members of Parliament. This was a great bone

of contention on the part of many individual Trade Unionists, but the difficulty has been largely overcome since the passage of the law in 1911 providing for the payment of members of Parliament.

The affairs of the committee of the Labor Party are transacted by an executive committee of 13, of whom nine represent the Trade Unions, one the Trade Councils, and three the Socialist societies.

At the General Election of 1900, the Labor Representation Committee endorsed fifteen candidates for Parliament, of whom two were elected—Richard Bell, at Derby (the President of the Railwaymen's Unions), and Keir Hardie, at Merthyr Tydfil. In 1902, David James Shackelton, a weaver and Trade Union leader, was endorsed by the committee, and was returned unopposed for the Clitheroe District, Lancashire. He was made Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress, and has been made Chairman of the Labor Party in the House of Commons, although he is not a Socialist. In 1910 he was appointed Labor Advisor to the British Government.

In the General Election of January, 1906, the Committee endorsed 53 candidates for Parliament, and elected 30 members. Besides these, 23 Labor members were elected on the nomination of various Trade Union bodies, independent of other parties. These 53 Labor-Socialist members—for that is what they really are—did not include a number of other "Laborites" and Fabian Socialists or "Independents" affiliated with the Radical wing of the Liberal Party.

Later on in the Session, the number of members officially classed as Labor-Socialists (although several are not avowed Socialists, strictly speaking), was 55,

of whom 49 are returned from England, 4 from Wales, and 2 from Scotland. It is very significant that no Socialists are returned from Ireland, although a number of the Home-Rule "Nationalists" are given occasionally to coquetting with the Socialists, and as a consequence sometimes incur disciplinary censure from the ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church. Among the 55 Labor-Socialist members was Victor Grayson, the "stormy petrel" of British Socialism. He scorned to be classed among the "Laborites," but was proud of being distinguished as the only "pure and simple" Marxian Revolutionary Socialist in the British Parliament. He is a self-made man, and, while somewhat eccentric, is possessed of no little ability. He was endorsed by the Independent Labor Party, but not by the Labor Party. He was elected at a bye-election in July, 1907, in the Colne Valley (Yorkshire) district, his election creating a great sensation through Great Britain, for two reasons: It was the first time in the history of Parliament that an out-and-out Revolutionary Socialist, without qualification, Labor or otherwise, had ever been elected; and then Grayson defeated both his Liberal and Conservative opponents combined, the Liberal candidate being a son of John Bright.

Socialism Submerges Trade Unionism.

The extraordinary success of the Labor-Socialists in the General Elections of 1906 sent a thrill of enthusiasm through the ranks; and the conservative elements of society and the anti-Socialists became much alarmed. There was one great fact standing out like a mountain peak in British politics, and that was that Socialistic ideas had got the complete ascendency in the Trade

Unions—the biggest organized force in the Kingdom.

The last of the great Trade Unions to hold out against the Socialist alliance was the Miners' Federation; and the fact is worth noting because in the United States the Miners' Unions in the Western States have been the first of the native American Labor organizations to declare for Socialism. In 1906 the British Miners' Federation, which is the largest Labor organization in the United Kingdom (having a membership of over 500,000), rejected a proposal to affiliate with the Labor Party (which is Socialist, as explained above), by 101,714 to 92,222—a majority of 9,492 against. In 1907 the ballot resulted in 213,317 for affiliation, to 168,294 against—a majority of 45,023 in favor of affiliation. The Miners' Federation have 15 Members of Parliament.

The Labor Party has committed itself—and in so doing has committed the Trade Unions affiliated with it—to International Socialism. At the International Socialist Bureau, which met at Brussels October 10-12, 1908, the most important matter which came up for settlement was the application of the British Labor Party for representation in the International Socialist Congresses. The question had been referred to the Bureau by the preceding International Socialist Congress, held at Stuttgart. Karl Kautsky, the famous German Socialist editor, offered the following resolution:

> In consideration of the resolutions of past International Congresses, accepting all the organizations which take up their stand upon the ground of the class struggle and recognize the need of political action;
>
> The International Bureau declares that it admits the Eng-

> lish Labor Party to the International Congresses, because, without explicitly accepting the proletarian class struggle, it is practically engaged in that struggle: because, thanks to its own organization, it is independent of the bourgeois parties and places itself in consequence on the ground of International Socialism.

An Englishman opposed the resolution. It was no less a person than Henry Mayers Hyndman, who represented the British Marxian Socialist Society, the Social Democratic Federation. He claimed that the British Labor Party does not take its stand unequivocally on the class struggle; and that if it was admitted, there would be no excuse for excluding the American Federation of Labor. [It might be remarked that Socialists consider the American Federation of Labor as a "capitalistic" organization, for the reason that it is founded upon the "wage system."]

The Kautsky resolution was adopted with substantial unanimity. This action, and other incidents recently, raise the question whether Marxian Socialism on the Continent itself is not shedding its cast-iron clothing of strict Revolutionary orthodoxy.

At the Conference of the Labor Party, held at Hull, January 20-22, 1908, the following amendment to the constitution, with the object of making Socialism specifically the basis of the party, was defeated by 91,000 for, to 951,000 against:

> . . . To organize and maintain a Parliamentary Party, with its own whips, whose ultimate object shall be the obtaining for the workers the full results of their labor by the overthrow of the present competitive system of capitalism and the institution of a system of public ownership and control of all the means of life.

But at the same Conference the following resolution was adopted by a vote of 514,000 for, to 469,000 against:

> That, in the opinion of this Conference, the time has arrived when the Labor Party should have as a definite object the socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, to be controlled by a democratic State in the interest of the entire community and the complete emancipation of Labor from the domination of capitalism and landlordism, with the establishment of social and economic equality between the sexes.

To most people this is a distinction without a difference, as a question of principle. The contradictory attitude of the Labor Party was really nothing but a supposed piece of "smart" diplomacy. It declined to make Socialism one of its specific constitutional bases, but it declared for the "ultimate aim" of Socialism—Collectivism.

At the ninth annual Congress of the Labor Party, held at Portsmouth, January 27-29, 1909, it was decided to continue the rule against permitting candidates of the Labor Party standing for Parliament as Socialists —that is, they must primarily stand as Labor candidates; but this was simply a matter of party discipline, and the situation remains that in a practical sense the Parliamentary candidates of the Labor Party are committed to Socialism.

As to Trade Unionism itself, several National Congresses have passed resolutions of a general Socialist nature. In 1894 the Congress at Norwich declared by 219 to 61, that it was "essential for the maintenance of British industries to nationalize the land and all the means of production and exchange;" and on a number of subsequent occasions resolutions have been passed

by Trade Union Congresses in favor of the nationalization of land, mines, and railways.

In the *International Socialist Review* (Chicago), of October, 1909, H. M. Hyndman, the founder and still the leading spirit of the Marxian Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain, had a bitter article criticising the heterodox Opportunism of the British Labor-Socialists. He agrees with M. Clemenceau, of France, that the English working class is "a bourgeois class," and he adds:

> It is ignorant, prejudiced, anxious to make petty profits for itself, and given over, in many cases, especially in the north of England and Wales, to the most canting and loathsome form of Religionism. Consequently, it has accepted in full the political economy of its worst enemies, holds that compromise is the highest wisdom, never accepts any definite principle with a view to pushing it to a conclusion, and believes that there is no way out of the present miserable system, because the governing classes say so.

As to the Independent Labor Party, our critic declares that "they have been content to accept with gratitude just what the Liberals thought proper to chuck to them, and are now being rapidly absorbed into the capitalist Liberal Party;" and he concludes his diatribe by the assertion that "the Labor Party in England to-day is the greatest obstacle to Socialist progress at home."

Has Socialism Been Halted?

In spite of the apparently resistless sweep of Socialism over official Trade Unionism, there is a suspicion creeping into the minds of even many Socialists that the tide has reached its height, at least, for a time. There were two special reasons for the extraordinary

development of Socialism among the Trade Unionists, apart from the general one of the natural effect of the never-ceasing work of propagandism carried on with such masterly subtlety by the Socialists, particularly the Fabians. The first was the "Taff Vale decision," in 1901, by which funds of Trade Unions could be held for damages in trade disputes. The Socialists were quick to adopt the policy of fanning the deep resentment aroused by this decision; and the Trade Unionists got desperate, and were in a humor to accept anything which promised to hit Capitalism on the head. The second reason was the terribly bad times industrially which had prevailed in England for several years. But some of the most level-headed Trade Unionists now recognize—although but few are bold enough to publicly declare it (for organized Labor opinion in England as elsewhere is inclined to be despotic and to be intolerant of difference when it has been officially declared)—that in passing the Trades Disputes Act, in 1906, Parliament went as far as public opinion would stand by way of granting special privileges to organized Labor. They could see that even though the Trade Unions in their collective capacity at Labor Congresses might pass Socialist resolutions (possibly merely a "pious opinion," as apologetically stated by some of the leaders in reference to the Hull declaration in favor of Socialism of the Labor Party, in 1908), yet that did not necessarily mean that there had been a further growth of Socialism among the working classes generally, in an individual sense. They could not fail to take note of the unmistakable fact that the British people, irrespective of party, and to some extent irrespective of condition, had become alarmed at the spectre

of Socialism which had suddenly confronted them, arising from nobody knew where, except it might be the abyss of Revolution and Atheism, and was therefore a fiend incarnate to the average Britisher. Heretofore, the Socialists—whether the bland and suave Fabian or the blood-red and fiery Social Democrat—had had the controversy all their own way, both in street-corner "spouting" and in penny pamphlets and six-penny paradisaical accounts of the coming Collective Commonwealth, when there will be a minimum of work and a maximum of play, with everything given away for nothing. Now, for the first time, organized opposition to Socialism began to appear. It is true that the Socialist papers "pooh-pooh" the opposition, and systematically tell how the "antis" are always routed in argument. But, all the same, the arguments against Socialism are getting a hearing. It is beginning to be appreciated that there is another side to this question of Socialism. In a little time it developed that there were Trade Unionists who objected to being compelled to pay the election expenses of men for Parliament who stood for things, politically, socially and economically, in which they did not believe; and the point was raised that their Trade Union was not established nor did they join it for any such purpose. So the courts were invoked to test the question whether a loyal Trade Unionist can be compelled to pay this political assessment if he does not want to do so, without subjecting himself to the alternative of being expelled from the Union and being consigned to the outer darkness of "scabdom," which in many trades in England would mean the deprivation of the only way to get a living. The Courts have de-

cided against the Trade Unions, and a compromise has been reached.

Statistical returns show that the Socialist organizations proper have not grown much in membership within recent years, but that the movement owes its recent increased strength in Great Britain to the "alliance" with the Trade Unions.

The figures below are taken from the "I. L. P. Year Book for 1909," and are therefore official. They show the growth of the organizations directly affiliated with the Labor Party; but the figures do not include half the entire number of British Trade Unionists (particularly the miners):

	Trade Unions:		Trades Councils and L. R. C.'s.	Socialist Societies:		Total
	No.	Member-ship.		No.	Member-ship.	Member-ship.
1900-1	41	353,070	7	3	22,861	375,931
1901-2	65	455,450	21	2	13,861	469,311
1902-3	127	847,315	49	2	13,835	861,150
1903-4	165	956,025	76	2	13,775	969,800
1904-5	158	885,270	73	2	14,730	900,000
1905-6	158	904,496	73	2	16,784	921,280
1906-7	176	975,182	83	2	20,885	996,067
1907-8	181	1,049,673	92	2	22,267	1,071,940

The total membership for 1906-7 includes 2,271 co-operators; and for 1907-8 the total membership includes 473 co-operators.

It is not possible to give any reliable figures as to the membership of the Marxian body, the Social Democratic Federation. The total paying membership throughout the Kingdom is said to be about 10,000. At the annual Conference held at Manchester, in 1908, it was stated

that 57 new branches had been established during the year. But there are no figures available showing how many branches had lapsed, or how the total membership stood in comparison with former years. At this Conference a resolution to re-affiliate with the Labor Party was negatived.

It should be clearly understood that the official paying membership of the Socialist organizations only partly represent the full Socialist vote at national and local elections.

In the Autumn of 1911 there was held at Manchester a Conference of the "Revolutionary" Marxian Socialists, composed of delegates from the Social Democratic Party, the newly-formed "British Socialist Party," "Clarion" groups, and local branches of the Independent Labor Party. It was notable that no Fabian delegates were present. Steps were taken to form one consolidated Revolutionary Marxian Party in contradistinction to the Fabians, "Reformists," or "Opportunists." This re-organized Revolutionary Marxian Party has an enrolled membership of 35,000.

The Anti-Socialist Movement.

For some years there have been in existence several organizations, headed by members of the House of Lords, wealthy "captains of industry," titled landlords, and a few college professors, formed for the purpose of combating Socialism, particularly in the field of publications and public addresses. This "counter" movement did not attract much public attention, and it had but little influence; in fact, its existence very likely actually aided the onward march of Socialism. But there has recently been started an attempt to establish a real live,

popular movement, by the Anti-Socialist Union of Great Britain. The policy of the Anti-Socialist Union is summarized in the terms: to organize, to combat, to educate. Three departments have been organized in the Union, they being the speakers' department, the publication department, and the intelligence department. Not only have the Socialists been distinguished for consummate political and organizing ability, but for some years they have had at their disposal a corps of the most adroit and persuasive platform orators and street-corner "stumpers" ever organized in Great Britain for any purpose, not even excepting the old Chartist days. The Anti-Socialist Union seem to fully appreciate this, and efforts are being made "to train a special brigade of anti-Socialist speakers, capable of meeting and beating the Socialists on their own ground." Every prospective speaker is required to pass a *viva voce* examination before appearing in public as a representative of the Union. In their "alarm call" to arouse the interest of the public, the Unions give out that Socialist meetings are being held at the rate of two thousand a week in Great Britain; that the Independent Labor Party and the Social Democratic Federation have 1,100 branches —an increase of 350 in eighteen months [this was in 1908]; that the Independent Labor Party alone is said to spend about £75,000 yearly on organization and propagandism, and it is estimated that the total annual expenditure on Socialist organization and propaganda in Great Britain is between £200,000 and £250,000; that there are now ten distinct organizations actively engaged in propagating Socialism in England, the Independent Labor Party alone having more than 800 speakers and district organizers. But this statement

gives only a faint idea of the activity of the Socialists. Each number of the *Clarion,* the weekly organ of militant Socialism, gives several columns of advertisements of lectures, debates, meetings, demonstrations, "socials," dances, services at Socialist Churches and Sunday-schools, and announcements of gatherings and all sorts of functions, literary, political and social, of "Clarion Scouts," "Clarion Cycling Clubs," etc.; and there are pages of matter descriptive of the doings of Socialists, male and female, young and old. There can be no question, after a perusal of a copy of the *Clarion,* of the absolute earnestness, devotion and enthusiasm of the Socialists.

Within the past year or so several of the old-established anti-Socialist societies, which had not been active for some time, have resumed their campaign against the enemy. The principal one of these organizations is the London Municipal Society, to whose work is to be largely attributed the Socialist rout at the municipal elections of 1907 in the metropolis. The Municipal Society has published two well-written and strong books against Socialism—*The Case Against Socialism* and *Socialism in Local Government.* Other anti-Socialist societies which have recently become active are: the Industrial Freedom League, the Liberty and Property Defence League, the Anti-Socialist League, the Anti-Socialist Department of the Liberal-Unionist Council, and the British Constitutional Association. Several of these organizations have adopted the plan of the Anti-Socialist Union in maintaining a special department in which speakers are trained to meet the professional Socialist platform and street orators. This anti-Socialist campaign has been much strengthened lately by the grow-

ing revolt of a not insignificant number of Trade Unionists against their societies being "captured" by the Socialists, and particularly against their having been compelled to pay toward the election expenses and the salaries of Socialist members of Parliament, although the last-named grievance has largely disappeared through compromise and the law providing for the payment of members. One of the most effective arguments used by the anti-Socialist speakers is that the "Socialist tail" wags the "Trade Union dog"—reference being had to the insignificant number of "definite" Socialists in the "alliance" as compared with the great number of Trade Unionists. Nevertheless, it remains true that the spirit of Socialism has permeated British Trade Unionism; although it is by no means unlikely that further acquaintance with the Marxian philosophy and the logic of hard, practical experience will in time lead to a realignment or a change of attitude in this regard. The latest development of the anti-Socialist movement is the organization of a Ladies' Brigade of trained public speakers.

CHAPTER XI

CONTINENTAL SOCIALISM

The Menace of Socialism, by W. Lawler Wilson, is the most scorching and one of the strongest of recent criticisms. The author insists that Revolution and Anarchy are the soul and genius of the movement throughout the world, no matter in what guise it may present itself. The great catastrophe which he argues must inevitably come, is imminent, he declares; and as to its chief theatre of action, he says:

> The menace of Socialism—whether it takes the form of insurrectionary violence, or the gradual corruption of society through the undermining of its base in private property—is virtually the same for the United States, Canada, or Australia, as for England or Germany. But Europe is the principal field of action, because it is the strategic centre of the Class War. In Europe the chief scenes in the great drama of the proletarian movement have been acted; in Europe the decisive conflict will be fought.

In Germany.

While the ultimate goal of Socialism is declared to be internationally identical, yet the developments and the practical expressions and methods of the operations of the Socialist idea differ in different countries. There is, indeed, a gradual modification going on—perhaps to some extent unconsciously—among Socialists in the very conception of Socialism; and nowhere is this pro-

cess of modification, both as to theory and practice, more marked within the last few years than in Germany, the classic home of Marxian Socialism. The popular belief that Modern Socialism originated in Germany is an error; but Germany has led all other countries in the growth of the Socialist philosophy among the masses, although within the last half-dozen years England has leaped to the front. All informed students of modern history, non-Socialists as much as Socialists, will agree with the learned and thoughtful English expounder of the movement, Thomas Kirkup (*History of Socialism*) that the "Social Democratic movement in Germany is one of the most notable phenomena of our time."

Although the optimistic expectations of Engels as to the early overthrow of Capitalism and of the present State in Germany have not been justified, yet the growth of the Socialist vote in Germany is the most marvellous instance of the development of a political party in history, not even excepting the Republican Party in the United States, in which case there were influences favoring it which cannot be called political, properly speaking. The following table shows the increase of the Socialist vote in Germany:

1867	30,000;
1877	493,000;
1887	763,000;
1892	1,876,000;
1897	2,107,000;
1903	3,010,000;
1907	3,259,000;
1912	4,000,000.

At the general election of 1907, the Socialists polled almost one-quarter of the total vote, and numerically they are now the most important political party in the Empire. In 1903, polling 3,010,771 votes, the Social Democrats secured a representation of 82 in the Reichstag (Imperial Parliament). In 1907 the vote was 3,258,961—an increase of a quarter of a million of votes; but the Socialist representation in the Reichstag was only 43—a loss of 39 seats, as compared with 1903, which is to be accounted for partly because of the peculiar combination of the opposing forces, but principally because of the operation of the Imperial Constitution, which militates against representation from the cities as compared with the country districts, according to population—and the Socialist vote is naturally mostly in the cities. The unfairness of this Constitutional provision is seen in the fact that, although the Roman Catholics (who form a separate group called the "Centre") polled, in 1907, 1,075,680 less votes than the Socialists, they had 105 representatives—62 in excess of the Socialists; and the Conservatives, who polled less than one-third as many votes as the Socialists, secured nearly twice as many seats. In 1907 there were about 2,000 Socialists elected Mayors or members of Communal or other Councils, although, speaking generally, these local elections are not on a democratic basis. There are 160 Socialist papers published in Germany, 78 of them being dailies, with a combined circulation of 1,160,000 in 1910, double that in 1904. A Socialist paper for women has a circulation of 85,000.

Incomplete returns received at this writing indicate that in the General Elections of January, 1912, the So-

cialists elected—including second ballotings—about 110 members, and cast about 4,000,000 votes.

The beginnings of German Socialism are associated with the names of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (born 1762, died 1814), and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (born 1770, died 1831). Fichte was a follower of Kant and advocated the State regulation of the production and distribution of goods. In one of his works (*Materials for the Justification of the French Revolution*) he says: "Property can have no other origin than labor. Whosoever does not work has no right to obtain the means of existence from society." Hegel has been called "the intellectual father of Karl Marx and of most of the early German Socialists." The latter admittedly drew most of their ideas from England; but the following men stand out prominently in the beginnings of German Socialism anterior to the present organization:

Heinrich Ludwig Lampert Gall (born 1790, died 1863). He is sometimes called the "first German Socialist." He founded a reformatory colony in America (near Harrisburg, Pa.), composed of thieves, harlots and convicts! Of course, it was a failure. Then he endeavored to form an international movement jointly with Robert Owen, of England, and Fourier and Saint-Simon, of France; and in 1835 he wrote a work in which the principles of Modern Socialism were outlined.

Victor Aimé Huber (born 1800, died 1869). He was the founder of German Christian Socialism, and was a strong advocate of Co-operation.

Johann Karl Rodbertus (born 1805, died 1875). Some authorities claim that he was a greater Socialist

than even Karl Marx. Prof. Adolf Wagner (a leading "Socialist of the Chair" and Christian Socialist) described Rodbertus as "the first, the most original, and the boldest representative of Scientific Socialism in Germany." Rodbertus frankly acknowledged his indebtedness to Adam Smith and Ricardo, the English economists. According to Rodbertus, rent is that income which is derived by virtue of a possession, and without labor; and there is rent from both land and capital. He proposed to abolish the present wage-system by substituting a "normal" work-day, with a normal form of wages. He did not believe in the State limiting the hours of labor, his theory being that that was an unjustifiable interference with personal liberty, and that the increase of wages would regulate that matter.

Wilhelm Weitling (born 1808, died 1874). He was an "Utopian" Socialist, and claimed that he was converted to Socialism by reading the New Testament, although he seems to also have imbibed the theories of the French Commune. He came to America in 1847; returned to Germany at the Revolution of 1848; and afterwards came back to America and founded a Socialist society called the "Arbeiterbund;" he was also interested in a Socialist colony in Wisconsin. His ideal form of Utopian Socialism was a federation of the families of the world, with a communistic distribution of the products, an extra share of the luxuries being given to those who produced more than the average. One writer described him as "the connecting link between present-day Socialism and its earlier forms." He was the first Socialist (at least, in Germany) to make an appeal especially to workingmen to support Socialism.

Hillquit says that the present-day Socialist movement

in Germany runs in an unbroken chain from the days of Ferdinand Lassalle (born 1825, died 1864). Heine called Lassalle "the Messiah of the nineteenth century;" and among the people he was known as the "father of Social Democracy." In his youthful days Lassalle was a revolutionist, and he was in prison for six months for participation in the troubles of 1848; but later he grew to be conservative. Like the "Master," Marx, and so many other brilliant lights in the economic and especially in the Socialist firmament, he was a Jew. "The birthday of German Socialism" is often the name given to the date April 12, 1862, when Lassalle lectured before an Artisans' Association, at Berlin; and for this speech he was arrested and fined. The Leipsic Workingmen's Association invited him to define a policy for them, as they were uncertain what attitude to adopt with regard to Co-operation; and in reply Lassalle wrote them an "Open Letter," which is called "the Charter of German Socialism," in which he advocated the formation of Co-operative societies with State aid. He had a genius for organization, and he took an active part in forming, on May 23, 1863, the Universal German Workingman's Association, which afterwards became an integral part of the present Social Democratic Party. While, of course, the name of Marx holds supreme in Germany, as elsewhere, as the great philosophical founder of Modern Socialism, yet that of Lassalle stands first in Germany as the actual originator of the present movement in that country. After having studied the question from the Hegelian point of view, Lassalle learned his first lesson in Revolutionary Socialism at Paris, which at that time was the centre of attraction for Radicals of all nationalities. His relations with the

Countess Hatzfeldt "did not," as Kirkup so guardedly puts it, "tend to improve Lassalle's position in German society. Rightly or wrongly, people had an unfavorable impression of him, as of an adventurer. . . . His conduct was a mixture of chivalry and business, which every one must judge for himself. It was certainly not in accordance with the conventionalities, but for these Lassalle never entertained much respect." Kirkup says that Lassalle's Socialism is similar to that of Rodbertus and Karl Marx, without Lassalle being a disciple of either of them, he having his own way of conceiving and expressing historic Socialism. His "Iron Law of Wages" is the most distinctive feature of his Socialism. "It holds the same prominent place in his system of thinking as the theory of surplus value does in that of Marx. Both, it may be added, are only different aspects of the same fact." Lassalle described as follows (in part) this "Law" in the "Open Letter" above referred to: "The Iron Economic Law, which, in existing circumstances, under the law of supply and demand for labor, determines the wage, is this: that the average wage always remains reduced to the necessary provision which, according to the customary standard of living, is required for subsistence and for propagation." Further on he says: "From the produce of labor so much is taken and distributed among the workmen as is required for their subsistence. The entire surplus of production falls to the capitalist. It is therefore a result of the Iron Law that the workman is necessarily excluded from the benefits of an increasing production, from the increased productivity of his own labor." Lassalle does not claim to have been the discoverer of this "Iron Law," but he acknowledges that he accepted it

as taught by Ricardo and other economists of England, as well as of France and Germany. This theory, however, is not now generally accepted even by Socialists. Kirkup himself (who is an avowed but a discriminating Socialist), says that Lassalle's theory is "inaccurate and untenable;" John Spargo (who is more of a Marxian than is Kirkup) ridicules Lassalle's "Iron Law." He says "there is no such thing." Lassalle acknowledged that the "Iron Law" was the keystone of his system, and that his doctrines stood or fell with it. The non-Socialist view is strongly put by Prof. Flint, in his analytical work, *Socialism:* "Lassalle's exaggeration of Ricardo's conclusion is a gross caricature of the real law, devoid of theoretical justification, and decisively contradicted by the history of wages. The law of wages tends to press us down to bare subsistence not otherwise than water tends to drown us." Prof. Ely says that Lassalle's writings did not advance materially the theory of social democracy, but he clothed the thoughts of Rodbertus and Marx "in such manner as to enable ordinary laborers to understand them, and this they never could have done without such help. Even for an educated man their works are not easy reading; for the uneducated they are quite incomprehensible." Hillquit gives this high estimate (*Socialism in Theory and Practice*): "Of extraordinary eloquence, profound learning and indomitable energy, Lassalle was probably the most powerful popular tribune produced by the nineteenth century." It is a remarkable fact that Lassalle had the friendship of Bismarck.

In 1869 a new Socialist party, more strictly Marxian, was formed, principally through the efforts of Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel. There was a feud be-

tween the different Socialist organizations, which was terminated in 1875 by their amalgamation at the famous Gotha Convention, and the present Social Democratic Party was formed; and Liebknecht and Bebel became the permanent leaders. After being imprisoned because of participation in the revolution of 1848 Liebknecht fled to England, where he became a friend of Marx, whose views he espoused. Upon returning to Germany he joined Lassalle's agitation, and became leader of the International movement; and he was again imprisoned several times.

Bebel has been for many years the leading Socialist in the Reichstag; he, also, has been imprisoned. He may be considered the greatest living German Socialist —and, indeed, in the world—and his speeches are much quoted. During the Commune in Paris in 1871 Bebel made a speech in the Reichstag, in which was the following passage:

> Be assured that the entire European proletariat, and all that have a feeling for freedom and independence in their heart, have their eyes fixed on Paris. And if Paris is for the present crushed, I remind you that the struggle in Paris is only a small affair of outposts, that the main conflict in Europe is still before us, and that ere many decades pass away the battle-cry of the Parisian proletariat, war to the palace, peace to the cottage, death to want and idleness, will be the battle-cry of the entire European proletariat.

The German authorities have never forgiven Bebel for this speech.

Modification of German Socialism.

It is a curious fact that when the Social Democratic Party was organized in 1875 it made a declaration, in

what has got to be known as "the Gotha Programme," which has been widely accepted as "Marxian" in both America and England, but which, as a matter of fact, was adopted—under pressure from Lassalle—in spite of the vehement protest of Marx. The declaration referred to is that "Labor is the source of *all* wealth and civilization." This assertion is now admitted by all the leading Socialists who understand economics to be wrong, and the sentence has been modified in nearly all authoritative Socialist declarations, although it is still made to do service in the hands of some of the lesser responsible writers and speakers, in Socialist newspapers, pamphlets, etc., and by street-corner haranguers, and in fact is still held as sound Socialism by the great proletariat. Spargo is very indignant that critics should make "misrepesentations" as to this point. He says: "A draft [of the Programme] was submitted to Marx and he wrote of it that it was 'utterly condemnable and demoralizing to the party.' Of the passage in question, he wrote: 'Labor is *not* the source of all wealth. Nature is just as much the source of use-values (and of such, to be sure, is material wealth composed) as is Labor, which itself is but the expression of a natural force, of human labor-power.'" Nevertheless, the declaration as objected to by Marx stood at the head of the programme of the German Social Democracy for many years.

The same paragraph of the Programme contained another declaration around which there has waged a warm warfare between different schools of German and English Socialists, it being to the effect that the division of the products of Labor "belongs by an equal right to all its members, each according to his reasonable *needs*." There is much dispute as to whether true Marxian Social-

ism should not read *"deeds"* instead of *"needs."* Most of the "persuasive" sort of Socialists, anticipating the criticism which attaches to the Communistic *needs,* are careful to explain that under Socialism rewards will be given and supplies furnished according to *deeds.* But, there is ample warrant for the statement that the trend of intellectual thorough-going Revolutionary-Socialism, English and American as well as German, is in the direction of doling out supplies according to *needs;* indeed, not to be Communistic in this regard, would, according to some Socialists, have the effect of creating "classes" under Socialism.

These declarations of the Gotha Programme have been such bones of contention not only between anti-Socialists and Socialists, but among Socialists themselves, that the entire paragraph is here given:

> 1. Labor is the source of all wealth and civilization, and since productive labor as a whole is made possible only in and through society, the entire produce of labor belongs to society; that is, it belongs by an equal right to all its members, each according to his reasonable needs, upon condition of a universal obligation to labor.

In 1878 attempts on the life of the Emperor were made by Socialists, and Bismarck applied coercive measures. Up to a certain point these measures appear to have been successful in repressing Socialism, and it is not unlikely that they prevented a rebellion. But Bismarck extended coercion beyond a reasonable time, and the natural result followed. Socialism, after a period of disorganization, arose stronger than ever, and in 1890 it polled 1,427,000 votes, and thus became the strongest single party in the Empire. But while the Socialist vote was increasing,

and has been increasing ever since, there has been a process of not only a change in tactics but of a modification of theories going on. The truth is that strict Marxian Socialism has not been able to stand against the streams of criticism which have been turned upon it in Germany, and which have only within recent years been active in England and America; and these streams did not all have anti-Socialist sources. In Germany the gradual shedding of the Marxian shell has come about through the operation of a stupendous and ponderous course of philosophical reasoning; in England the "Fabianization" of Socialism has come about in a natural and characteristic way, simply by the operation of the national spirit of Compromise and Opportunism.

The first problem as to tactics which confronted the Social Democracy of Germany was in regard to the attitude it should adopt towards Bismarck's State Socialism, which is often denounced by Socialists in the Fatherland as "State Capitalism." [State and Municipal Socialism is treated of in a separate chapter.]

Of recent years the tendency in Germany has been to drift away from the strict doctrinaire Revolutionary Socialism, and to adopt a policy of Opportunism, although the legions of Bebel and Kautsky still declare for Collectivism, to come about by the "class-conscious" struggle of the proletariat. There is a faction among the German Socialists who are revolutionary to the extent of being Anarchistic, and they object to the Opportunist tactics and to the "parliamenting" of present-day Socialism. Some of these malcontents were expelled from the Social Democratic Party; they endeavored to form a new party, the Union of Independent Socialists, but they have not been able to enroll many members, although no doubt

there is great dissatisfaction with the present policy of the Social Democratic Party.

In 1891 Engels published for the first time the "Marginal Notes" of Marx on the Gotha Programme. The criticisms contained therein caused some embarrassment to the official leaders of the Social Democratic Party and to the Socialist members of the Reichstag; and it is said that it was owing to these criticisms of Marx which caused a revision of the platform, at Erfurt, October 14-20, 1891. It is claimed that the Erfurt platform was a victory of Marxism over the principles of Lassalle; but the ascendency of Marxism did not last long unchallenged. The critics of Marxism were headed by George von Vollmar and E. Bernstein; their school is known as the "Revisionist" or Evolutionary wing, and their position with regard to State Socialism and ameliorative measures is similar to that taken by the English Fabians. To harmonize the differences, and to present a united front to their critics on the outside, the Social Democratic Party in 1892 passed a resolution which, while it repudiated State Socialism by name, accepted it in fact as "some trifling part payment." Bernstein went further than Vollman, and took issue with the fundamental doctrines laid down by Marx and Engels, not only with regard to "the materialistic theory of history," but also as to the great "kladderadatsch"—the cataclysm which is to destroy the present social and industrial system and bring in the Collective Commonwealth. Arrayed against Vollmar and Bernstein were Liebknecht, Bebel and Kautsky. The agreement made between the different schools of German Socialism is a sort of patch-work arrangement: one pronouncement is for a straight-out, uncompromising "class-conscious" Revolutionary Socialism, while an

accompanying one is practically for Fabian Opportunism; and the subsequent developments are increasingly in the latter direction.

One wing of the Social Democracy opposed any participation in elections, holding that the act of voting was a submission by the proletariat to the existing capitalistic regime; another wing tolerated participation in elections simply as a means of agitation for the purpose of educating the workingmen in the principles of Socialism, but this wing opposed participation in Parliamentary activities; another wing favored political alliances with other Parliamentary groups or political parties, with the view of securing a particular object, and these compromisers were denounced as traitors to true Socialism. In the wordy discussions which took place over these differences, particularly in regard to Trade Unions and Co-operation, it became manifest that the opposition to these rival movements arose largely from the fear that they would bring about such an improved condition among the working people that they would lose their interest in the theories of Socialism. This was also the case in England.

On all these points of difference there have been modifications—and in some respects an actual transformation —of the original position taken by the German Social Democratic Party; and now it no longer holds good that the Social Democracy is a strictly orthodox Marxian party. Still, it clings to the "class-conscious" formula, and especially to the "ultimate aim"—the common ownership of the means of production and the social organization of production and exchange; and as an organization the Social Democracy isolates itself from other political parties.

Collectivism, by Paul Leroy Beaulieu, is placed (at least by non-Socialists) at the front of recent masterly criticisms of Marxian Socialism. In that work Beaulieu presents a summary and analysis of Bernstein's argument against Collectivism, comparing it with that made by Jean Léon Jaurès, the leader of the present reorganized French Socialists; and he proceeds: " . . . Jaurès himself has abandoned, on more than one point, the theories of Marx, and has recognized the falsity of his prophecies. Kautsky, in Germany, and still more, Guesde, in France, are, exclusive of the aged Bebel, almost the only avowed upholders of unadulterated Marxism at the present time." Beaulieu considers that by Bernstein's "destructive criticism" of the Marxian doctrine " 'Scientific Socialism' is finally destroyed, and the idol before which two generations have prostrated themselves vanishes and leaves no trace."

The controversy between the two schools of German Socialism was very bitter in 1910, and for the time being caused a rupture.

The organization of Social Democratic women is advancing by leaps and bounds in Germany. It commenced in 1906; in 1909 there were 62,000 enrollments; in 1911 there were 100,000.

In May, 1910, there was a law passed controlling the potash trade, which a writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* (July, 1911) declares "goes further in the direction of Socialism than any previous legislation in Germany." Incidentally this law has been the subject of diplomatic exchanges between Washington and Berlin, a claim having been set up by some American concessionaires that the law amounted to a repudiation of contracts. This law assigns to each potash mine a certain percentage of

the total product of the country, and lays a prohibitory tax upon what it produces in excess of that allotment. It fixes the maximum price for the home market and prohibits selling abroad at a lower price. Wages cannot be reduced without the consent of the employees—otherwise the allotment of output is restricted.

The writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* observes that in Germany "the individual withers," and the State is "more and more."

French Socialism.

While, to the Anglo-American mind, German Socialism is generally associated with philosophical profundity, French Socialism is nearly always associated with violence and bloodshed. And yet, France shares with England the distinction of being the birth-place of the Philosophical, the Utopian, and the Christian phases of Socialism. Kirkup, in *An Enquiry into Socialism,* notes that John Stuart Mill has narrated in his autobiography how the growth of his opinions was affected by the discussions of French Socialism. Before 1848 Paris was the centre of Socialist and revolutionary ideas. In the middle of the 18th century was a French economist named Morelly (or Morelli or Morellet), whose writings were influential in forming the theories of the French Revolution; and his ideas were for a time mistakenly attributed to Diderot. Morelly's *Code of Nature* was the inspiration of the Socialism of François Noel Babeuf (born 1764, guillotined in May, 1797), self-styled *Caius Gracchus.* Victor Cathrein, the Jesuit critic of Socialism, says in his standard Catholic work, that Babeuf was "the first to raise the standard of modern Socialism." According to Babeuf's theory of Communism "the aim of

society is the happiness of all, and happiness consists in equality." How Babeuf influenced the thought of his times can be seen by the fact that the French Constitution of 1793 declared: "All men are equal by nature;" and "the purpose of Society is universal happiness." The basis of Babeuf's system was equality, and to realize this equality he formulated the following demands—and it will be observed how Babeuf anticipated later Socialists: Every one was to be obliged to work; the time of work was to be determined by law; production was to be regulated by a supreme committee elected by the people; necessary work was to be allotted to the citizens; disagreeable jobs were to be performed in turn by every citizen; each citizen was to have a right to all commodities, which were to be distributed according to his needs. Truly does Cathrein remark: "At bottom Babeuf's demands are identical with those formulated by Bebel and other modern Socialists."

[The Socialism of the French Utopians, Cabet, Saint-Simon and Fourier, is treated of elsewhere in this volume.]

Utopianism was followed by political Socialism, and the name of Louis Blanc (born 1811, died 1882) comes up as that of "the first State Socialist." To this day there is disagreement as to whether the French Government was responsible for the failure of Louis Blanc's "National Workshops." Blanc and his party advocated the *droit au travail*—the right of laborers to demand work from the government if they could not find it elsewhere. Such an authority as Prof. Ely, in *French and German Socialism,* asserts that official documents prove that the real purpose of the French Ministers in making a pretext of carrying out the *droit au travail* by the erec-

tion of *ateliers sociaux* (social workshops) was to discredit Louis Blanc and cause the scheme to fail, and thus to demonstrate its impracticability. But there is incontrovertible testimony that the scheme was inherently wildly impracticable. That it was a tragic failure is a matter of history, and its aftermath was a bloody drama; the frenzied disappointed unemployed broke out in a saturnalia of insurrection, and 3,000 were killed in the fighting against the government forces, and over 3,000 were transported to Algeria.

The great figure in French Socialism next to Blanc is that of Pierre Joseph Proudhon (born 1809, died 1865). His name is forever connected with his promulgation of the doctrine that "property is theft," although he did not originate it. Says Prof. Ely: "Proudhon was the first to attempt to prove directly and scientifically that private property *per se* was a monstrosity—was robbery." Proudhon considered private property the greatest obstacle to Communism. In his ideal society there would be the most absolute equality of remuneration; the duration of labor was the only just measure of value; and compensation should be equal for the same duration of labor, independent of the skill or knowledge required, or the nature of the labor. Next to his famous declaration as to private property, Proudhon is chiefly known as the father of Philosophic Anarchism.

For some years after the Paris Commune there was but little heard of Socialism in France. In 1878 the General Trade Union Congress at Lyons endorsed Socialist candidates, and a number of the Unions declared for the entire Socialist programme; and in 1879 the General Trade Union Congress itself pronounced for Socialism. Since then there have been a number of "splits" on the

old troublesome question of Opportunism and of advocating ameliorative legislation versus strict Marxian Socialism. These disagreements divided the party until 1905, when there was a union formed of the various groups and schools under the name of *Parti Socialist de France,* or *Le Parti Socialist.*

The growth of Socialism in France is shown by the increase of the Socialist vote in Parliamentary elections cast in the years given below:

1885	30,000;
1887	47,000;
1889	120,000;
1893	440,000;
1898	700,000;
1902	805,000;
1906	1,000,000.

At the general elections in 1910 the United Socialists increased their representation in the Chamber of Deputies from 54 to 76.

There was general surprise when the President of France selected a Socialist, M. Briand, to form a Cabinet; and there were forebodings when the new Premier called upon two Socialist comrades, MM. Millerand and Viviani, to be his colleagues. It was the prevailing assumption that France had again embarked upon the sea of Socialism. This expectation, however, has not been realized; the present Cabinet is not Socialist, but, if anything, it is rather the reverse. The Socialism of M. Briand is "a thing of the past," at least while he is Premier of France; and in a great strike of railroad men in 1910 he splendidly demonstrated the fact that he was the Chief Executive of the Republic. Like John Burns, the

British Socialist (as a working man), he became a conservative when he assumed the responsibilities of office; and, like John Burns, he is often called a "turn-coat" by his old comrades. At present Premier Briand is not considered a Socialist. M. Millerand—a member of the Cabinet—was "excommunicated" by the Socialists and the Masonic lodges several years ago; and as to M. Viviani (who is Minister of Labor), he appears to be an Opportunist Social Reformer rather than a Socialist. Still, as an English critic has pointed out, not one of these three high officials of the French Government has so far as publicly known recanted the Collectivist views formerly avowed.

In November, 1911, two notable figures in International Socialism, M. Lafargue and his wife Laura—a daughter of Karl Marx—committed suicide by taking prussic acid. M. Lafargue was 69 years of age. He was one of the leaders of Marxism in France. In a letter to Jules Guesde, the anti-Militarist leader, M. Lafargue explained that he was about to take his life to escape senile decay. Madame Lafargue committed suicide because she did not wish to survive her husband. It is an extraordinary and tragic coincidence that Mme. Lafargue's sister Eleanor committed suicide in London, in March, 1898. She was a very brilliant woman, and married a well-known English Socialist, Dr. Edward Aveling. It is said that the cause of her suicide was domestic unhappiness. It is due to the memory of Karl Marx himself to say that his domestic life and personal conduct were beyond reproach.

The Movement in Austria.

Socialism in Austria-Hungary was introduced from Germany. The greatest obstacle to its spread in the

dual-empire is that of race and national prejudices. It has developed mostly among the German speaking population, but the party is organized on a basis of national autonomy and international solidarity, and there are German, Czech, Polish, Italian, Slavic and Ruthenian sections. Arising out of the Revolution of 1848 there were efforts to secure social reform, and in 1859 an industrial code was adopted, the special object of which was to restore the relations of the manufacturers and workmen with the guilds, but the attempt was a failure. The Labor Party of Austria is Socialistic. In 1867 a partial right of assembly and association was granted; this was followed by a development of the movement, and the Workingmen's Mutual Improvement Society was formed that year. There was a division in 1868, and Anarchism manifested itself; indeed, there has always been considerable Anarchism in Austrian Socialism. Through the absorption of the Trade Union element there came a revival of Socialism, and in 1888 the party (with the exception of the Anarchists) united upon the principles of Marxian Socialism. In 1892 the Social Democrats expelled the Revolutionists, who thereupon joined the Anarchists. In Hungary there are two branches of the Socialist organization—one among the industrial workers, and the other among the agricultural laborers and the non-Hungarian rationalists. Within the last few years there has been considerable strength shown in Austria by a Roman Catholic Christian Socialist organization, under Prince John of Lichtenstein, and in Hungary by the Christian Laborers (a union of Christian Trade Unionists)—both of which are for the purpose of promoting social reform, but are opposed to the International Social Democracy. Largely because of the agitation carried on by the Social

Democrats, universal suffrage was granted, and at the general election of 1907 the Social Democrats elected 87 deputies to the Reichsrath,—a fifth of the whole Chamber—they polling 1,041,948 votes, nearly a third of the total vote cast. One of the most impressive public demonstrations ever held in any country by the proletariat was that held under the auspices of the Social Democracy at Vienna, on November 28, 1905, in favor of universal suffrage.

The Social Democratic Party of Austria-Hungary is strongly anti-Semitic, principally because the Jews have become the greatest land-owners in that country, and are the financial creditors of the peasantry. The Jews own one-quarter of the land in Hungary, and a single Jewish family, that of the Rothschilds, owns one-third of all Bohemia; the Jews are also large employers of labor, and they are said not to be good employers. But in the neighboring country of Roumania Socialism is very largely a movement promoted by the Jewish proletariat. The most prominent Austrian name in connection with Socialism is that of Dr. Albert Eberhard Friedrich Schäffle, formerly Minister of Commerce. His *Quintessence of Socialism* is considered by many authorities, both Socialist and anti-Socialist, to be the ablest exposition of Marxism ever written, not even excepting that by Engels. There have always been much uncertainty and speculation as to the actual personal views on Socialism held by Dr. Schäffle. Most certainly, after reading his *Quintessence,* one is almost justified in assuming that he is a convinced Socialist; but this he denies in his subsequent *Impossibility of Social Democracy,* which, except in two or three particulars (especially his monarchial bias) is accepted by most authorities as the keenest and most log-

ical refutation of Marxian philosophy ever published. In all literature it would be difficult to match Dr. Schäffle's *Quintessence of Socialism* and his *Impossibility of Social Democracy,* as a case of the poison and the antidote being prescribed by the same physician.

Italian Socialism.

No other American writer understands the Continental proletariat better than the brilliant Robert Hunter does. In his *Socialists at Work* he asserts that Socialism has taken hold of the masses of Italy in a way that cannot be paralleled in many other countries, and this he attributes to the brutalizing and oppressive policy of the upper classes, and he says that hatred, suspicion and fear are the only sentiments that can exist between them and the poor people. In Italy—as indeed, in all Latin countries—the fear of Socialism has become almost a mania. Hunter continues:

> In talking with well-to-do men, one frequently hears it said, with a kind of despair, that Socialism is inevitable. . . . In considering the Italian movement, one must always bear in mind the history and tradition of Italy. It has ever been a land of conspiracy, revolution and guerrilla warfare. "The psychology of Italy," an Italian author has said, "permits a vehement tendency to murder. This form of crime is only rarely disclaimed by the national *morale;* it is often glorified; and many of our moralists admit that the assassination of a compatriot sometimes resolves itself into a duty to the community." The history of all its political struggles, of all its uprisings against oppression, shows a tendency to run to extreme violence, even under the guidance of humanitarians such as Mazzini, Garibaldi, or the present-day Socialist leaders. It should also be borne in mind that the Italians were among the first in Europe to accept the Anarchist views of Bakounine.

Until the extension of the franchise in 1882 the Anarchists were the most important of the different groups participating in the workingmen's movements in Italy. Unlike their British, American and German comrades, the Italian Trade Unionists are largely in sympathy with the Anarchistic revolutionary school of Socialists; and in this particular the Italian Trade Unionists are like the French. The Italian Revolutionists are called "Syndicalists," because they believe that the "Syndicates" (which is the Italian name for the Trade Unions) are the sole hope for the overthrow of the present industrial and political conditions. [Of recent years "Syndicalism" has also become an active phase of French Socialism.] Since 1906—when the policy of the Italian Opportunists or Reformers was approved by five-sixths of the party—the anti-physical-force Revolutionary school have taken the name of "Integralists." In 1907 the "Syndicalists," in conjunction with the Trade Unionists, by an almost unanimous vote, resolved upon complete secession from the Socialist Party. During 1908 the bickerings between the different Socialist parties continued, although an attempt was made at a national convention at Florence to patch up the divisions, so that the various groups could present a united front to the common enemy. The two great heroes of Italy, Garibaldi and Mazzini, were both Republicans and Revolutionists, but they were not Socialists, and the latter opposed the policy of both the two patriots. Mazzini believed in association as opposed to competition; but he also believed in self-sacrifice, and his watchwords included "duties," as well as "rights;" and while Socialism has a great deal to say about "rights," it knows no such word as "duties." After a number of abortive attempts, a national party was formed in 1892,

and it was then that the Socialists formally withdrew from the Anarchists. In addition to the division as to Anarchism, there have been continued and bitter controversies in regard to the interminable question of the policy toward immediate reforms and parliamentary action; but with all the internal turmoils of the Italian Socialists they have rendered signal service to their country by exposing official corruption.

In 1911 the Italian Socialists made an unsuccessful attempt to arouse public sentiment against the government expedition for the conquest of Tripoli.

Russia's Revolutionary Socialism.

Revolution, Nihilism, Anarchism: these words are generally used to describe Socialism in Russia. Ensor, in his *Modern Socialism,* claims that "Socialism has played a great part in the upheaval in Russia." Coming from an accepted authority, this is a rather loose statement. There is very little real Socialism in Russia, that is, economic-political Socialism, as the term is understood in America, Germany or England. It may be said, indeed, that terrorism is a feature of all Russian political parties; yet terrorism, even though in recent times it has been associated with Socialism, would have existed just as violently and would have been just as chronic, had Marx never written *Capital.* It is absolutely impossible to compile a history of Socialism in Russia without including a résumé of desperate, bloody protests and struggles against cruel despotism, on each side the most terrible to be found in history; and the difficulty is in separating the agitation for Socialism, pure and simple, from this awful record. Even Socialists—that is, Germans, Englishmen and Americans, of the prevailing "constitutional"

type—seem in despair when talking or writing about Socialism in Russia. Of course, a general review of the situation in Russia at the present day as compared to what it was twenty years ago, affords some slight reason for hopefulness for a better state of things; but at the same time, the way is strewn with disappointments. It seems as if even such a beneficent act as the Emancipation of the Serfs, in 1861, has had a curse attached to it. Before then, Nihilism did not represent violence, but popular education; the Nihilists founded Sunday-schools and reading circles, although at the earliest period of their history revolutionary Socialism was popular among them. One Russian writer describes Nihilism as "a fatal unbelief in everything;" another calls it "the spirit of intellectual revolt." Nihilism seems to be a very part of the Russian nature—bred therein by centuries of oppression. Diderot explains that the extravagant temperament of the Russian people is owing to the fact that "they were rotten before they were ripe." There can be no doubt that the chief, if not the exclusive reason for the awful sanguinary disposition of nearly all political and social reformers in Russia is owing to the system of government—the most despotically oppressive in all modern history. The Germans describe the governmental system of Russia as being that of a "Functionary State" and not a "Law State"—that is, it is a government by arbitrary functionaries, and not by legal enactments. The emancipation of the serfs has not been an unmixed blessing, even to the peasants themselves. They have not as much land as they had before emancipation, and they do not receive as much of the produce of their labor as before. One of the greatest of the Revolutionary Socialists, Alexander Hertzen (born 1812, died 1870), was of the opinion

that Russia's deliverance would come by the application of the operations of the "Mir" to the national government of the Empire. Hertzen was a friend of Bakounin, the Revolutionary Anarchist, and he imbibed his principles. Naturally he got into trouble with the government, and was treated as a "dangerous person;" then he went to London and published a political and social paper called the *Kolokol* (Bell). After witnessing some of the Continental revolutions of 1848 Hertzen settled permanently in England, and from his retreat he addressed a letter (which has become famous) to the new Czar, Alexander II, urging him to give the people a more liberal government than his father, Nicholas, had done. In his younger days Hertzen believed in Socialism as the new "terrestrial religion," in which there was to be neither God nor heaven; in which all government, human or Divine, was to be absent. "Christianity," he averred, "made the slave a son of man; the Revolution has emancipated him into a citizen. Socialism would make him a *man*." But after being in England some time he grew away from these extreme revolutionary views; and to the young Russian exiles who would visit him he would say, "Our black earth needs a deal of draining." The friend of his youth, Bakounin, still an Anarchist, saw him in London, and found that Hertzen and he had parted company as to their opinions in regard to the regeneration of society and the way it should be brought about. Shortly before his death, Hertzen wrote a letter, full of dignified pathos, which was a renunciation of his former violent sentiments. The letter was presumably written to Bakounin, and both Socialists and anti-Socialists must agree that in its way it is a classic. Although Hertzen's influence with his fellow-countrymen waned

after his adoption of the principles of gradual reformation and amelioration in the place of those of physical-force Revolution, yet this letter is worthy to be treasured and kept in mind by Russian patriots of the present generation. He said:

> I will own that one day, surrounded by dead bodies, by houses destroyed with balls and bullets, and listening feverishly as prisoners were being shot down, I called with my whole heart and intelligence upon the savage force of vengeance to destroy the old criminal world, without thinking much of what was to come in its place. Since that time twenty years have gone by; the vengeance has come, but it has come from the other side, and it is the people who have borne it, because they comprehended nothing either then or since. A long and painful interval has given time for passions to calm, for thoughts to deepen; it has given the necessary time for reflection and observation. Neither you nor I have betrayed our convictions; but we see the question now from a different point of view. You rush ahead, as you did before, with a passion of destruction, which you take for a creative passion; you crush every obstacle; you respect history only in the future. As for me, on the contrary, I have no faith in the old revolutionary methods, and I try to comprehend the march of men in the past and in the present, to know how to advance with them without falling behind, but without going on so far before as you, for they would not follow me—they could not follow me!

As Prof. Rae (*Contemporary Socialism*) observes: "Bakounin was more in unison with the troubled spirit of the times" than was Hertzen. Bakounin has been described as the embodiment of a revolutionist. He was active in the International, and in connection with that organization he wrote: "We wish to destroy all states and all churches, with all their institutions and laws, . . . in order that all these millions of poor human

beings . . . may henceforth and forever breathe in absolute freedom."

It is not within the scope of this work to give even an outline of the revolutionary movement in Russia, for the reason that, properly speaking, as explained above, it should be considered as only incidental to economic Modern Socialism, and furthermore, it is part of the national history of the Russian people, running through many generations, quite independent of the theory and practice of economic Socialism. When Russia had developed industrially, then economic Socialism, of the Marxian kind, came in from Germany. Probably had the Russian Government and the Czar shown even a modicum of discerning sense of the irresistible tendencies of the times, Socialism would have developed along saner lines than it has done, and much sorrow and bloodshed would have been spared. Apart from the question whether Father Gapon was an honest and sincere friend of the people—which, in view of the after-revelations, seems a violent assumption—the young Czar had one of the greatest opportunities which the Almighty ever put into the hands of a monarch to bless his subjects and to secure for all time their loyal allegiance. But the fateful January 22, 1905, when Gapon's petition was met with a butchery of the poor unsuspecting people, has, at least for an indefinite period, killed non-physical-force Socialism, and has turned it into the bloody and secret channels of the old-style Anarchism. The mutinies among the sailors and soldiers of Russia, the futile "general strike" of the railroad workers, the granting of a sham constitution and the assembling of a supposed Parliament of the people, and its dismissal because it dared to show that it thought

it was a free assemblage—these events, following in rapid succession, are almost too recent to be history.

Russian Socialism is divided into three schools, or rather parties: (1) the Socialist Revolutionary Party; (2) the Social Democratic Party, which is Marxian; and (3) the Bund, composed of the Jewish proletariat. In regard to the land programme of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, which is for absolute confiscation, the agrarian population is in sympathy with it, and the Labor Group also acts with the Revolutionists. In the first Duma the proposition to socialize the land received only 33 votes, while in the second it received 105. The Social Revolutionists are devoting themselves to the peasantry, as they consider that the salvation of Russia must come through them. Although the Social Democrats are Opportunist to a certain extent, yet their goal is a Collectivist Republic, and for the accomplishment of this end they are agitating for universal suffrage.

Among the influences making for Socialism in Russia is the existence of some thirteen millions of "heretics," the majority of whom are divided into various religious sects, although a considerable number are free-thinkers. While as a class they are not political revolutionists, yet they are "reformers:" they condemn luxury and the accumulation of great wealth, they declaim against war and militarism, and declare for fraternity and mutual assistance.

In 1869 a number of secret societies amalgamated under the name of the Russian Branch of the International Workingmen's Association. In 1866 a member of one of these secret societies made the first attempt on the life of the Czar; and in 1873 eighty-seven persons were tried

for belonging to the International. By this time German economic Socialism was permeating Russia; a large edition of Marx's *Capital* was sold, and mothers had their children baptized in the name of Lassalle. But Socialism proper was soon drawn into the Nihilistic maelstrom, and Russian Anarchists, not content with their activities at home, organized and participated in revolutionary outbreaks in France.

Charles Lapworth has a supplementary chapter in Hunter's *Socialists at Work*, giving an account of the recent movement in some of the Continental countries. As to the situation in Russia he says that "the brief and eventful career of the Duma has clearly demonstrated that under normal conditions, and with universal suffrage, the Socialists would be in possession of governmental power." As to the first and second Dumas, the confidence which the autocracy had put in the peasants was altogether misplaced; for—

> Instead of supporting reaction, the peasants sent their own representatives to parliament. The government, therefore, changed completely the "constitution," so that the effect of the third election to the Duma is that an absolute majority is given into the hands of 135,000 of landed proprietors and rich bourgeois. Thus the parliament is composed of the privileged classes and their creatures. The new electoral law has given nearly three-fourths of the seats to the nobles, one-fourth to the rich bourgeois, leaving only a twentieth to the other classes. The erstwhile Socialist members have been sent to Siberia or to prison. And the struggle goes on.

In Finland, a province of Russia, enjoying certain rights and privileges not the property of the rest of the Empire, universal suffrage was recently granted to

women as well as to men, and at the first election thereunder 80 Socialists obtained seats, out of a total membership of 200, nine of them being women; and in 1908 the number of Socialists elected was 83. The Social Democratic Party was organized in 1903. The police will not allow any publications of the Social Democracy to be circulated. In 1905 the party had 50,000 paying members, of whom 10,000 were women. The concession of universal suffrage was forced from the Russian Government by an extraordinary and bold proceeding by the Finnish people. They proclaimed a "general political strike," formed practically a new provincial government, with a complete set of state departments, and everything went on its orderly way; and this brought St. Petersburg to terms.

In 1909 the Czar of Russia visited several foreign countries, and the Socialists—acting on a circular letter of the International Bureau—made vehement protests wherever he went.

On September 14, 1911, a terrorist named Bogrof assassinated Premier Stolypin by shooting him. It seems clear that he was forced to commit the crime under threat of death for treachery to "the cause," it being claimed that he was a police spy receiving a salary of $92 a month from the Government. Bogrof was executed privately within a few days.

In Poland the Socialists act with the German organization.

Belgian Socialism.

"The battle-ground of Europe" has many aspects of interest in connection with the subject matter of this book. It is the smallest country in Europe; it is the

most densely populated in the world; in no other country in the world is so large a proportion of the population engaged in purely industrial pursuits, manufacturing being by far the most important source of wealth; the *per capita* of exportations is the largest in the world; the population is the most illiterate in Europe; Belgium has more railroad mileage in proportion to the total square mileage than any other country in the world; it is the country from which Marx and Engels first issued their *Communist Manifesto,* in 1848; and it is the "Paradise of Capitalists." Surely, if there was ever rich soil for the growth of Socialism anywhere, it is Belgium. Yet, considering the long-continued and ever-strenuous efforts put forth, the growth of Socialism, in a political sense, in that country, has not been remarkable. But this fact, it should be explained, is owing largely, if not altogether, to the peculiar conditions attached to the franchise in that country. There is what is described as universal suffrage (with compulsory voting), but it is not equal: more than a third of the electors, those of some property and position, have two and even three votes each, while ths working men have only one vote each, although this inequality is neutralized to a slight extent by proportional representation of minorities.

The most distinctive feature of Belgian Socialism is Co-operation, which came down from the middle ages, and is not only commercial but political in its organization and activities. Some co-operators belong to the Clerical Party (Roman Catholic), and pledge themselves to the defense of "property, religion and the family." But most of the co-operators are members of the *Maison du Peuple* (House of the People), a branch of the Socialist-Co-operative organization, which started in a modest

way in 1879, and is now established in all the centres of industry throughout the country. From the profits of the Co-operative establishments a certain deduction is annually made for propaganda purposes. In 1906 these societies numbered 238, with sales amounting to $7,600,000; and over 100,000 peasants are members of the rival Clerical co-operative societies.

The Belgian Trade Unions are the successors of the trade benefit societies, which in turn were the successors of the medieval guilds, when the latter were abolished in 1795. Most of the Trade Unions belong to the Labor Socialist Party. In 1906 there were nearly 150,000 organized workers; and there is also in addition a Catholic Trade Union organization, numbering 17,000, affiliated with the Catholic International Workingmen's Association. The City of Ghent gives to each unemployed man one dollar for every dollar given to him by his Trade Union. There are throughout the country several thousand mutual societies which insure the workers against accident, sickness, old age and death.

In 1885 a Socialist Workingmen's Party was organized under the name of the *Parti ouvrier belge*. There was also a branch of the American Knights of Labor formed. In 1893 the Labor Party, aided by the Brussels *Maison du Peuple,* inaugurated a "universal strike" in favor of universal and equal suffrage; in a little over a week the government yielded certain concessions, but did not grant equal suffrage; and in 1902 there was another universal strike to force the government to grant equal suffrage, but it was not successful.

In 1906, out of 110 Senators, the Socialists elected six; and in the Chamber of Deputies, out of 116 members, the Socialists elected 35, there also being elected

two "Christian Democrats;" in 1908 the Socialists elected 36 members of the Chamber of Deputies. Of recent years the status of the party has been stationary, and it would seem as if the possibilities of any further material development, at least in voting and parliamentary strength, have been arrested under the unfair conditions of the ballot. There is another reason for the evident arresting of the growth of Socialism in Belgium: The party has from the first been identified with the extreme wing; the strongest section of the International was among the Belgians; and the movement naturally runs counter to the national religious sentiments of the people. This fact has been utilized by the Catholic Church, and it has organized a rival social-reform movement which appeals to a considerable section of the working people.

Socialism in Holland.

In the former Republic of the Netherlands, wealth is very unequally divided; wages are low, and the taxes fall heavily upon the working classes. A branch of the "International" was established in Holland in 1869, and ever since then Dutch Socialism has been inclined to Anarchism, although within recent years the development of Marxian principles has been marked. In 1878 there was a revival of Socialism succeeding the collapse of the "International." But it was an ex-Protestant minister, F. D. Nieuwenhuis, who established Modern Socialism in Holland. Pastor Nieuwenhuis left the Church because he became convinced that it was on the side of the rich against the poor, and he founded the Social Democratic Union in 1884. Three years later Nieuwenhuis was sent to prison "for political reasons," and the next

year he was elected to Parliament—the first Socialist to have a seat in that body. This ex-reverend Socialist finally became too radical for the other comrades, and in course of time he lost his influence. The division over Anarchism grew very sharp. In 1889 the Social Democratic League was founded, on Marxian lines. Referring to the "harmonious" existence of Anarchists among the Socialists in Holland, Rae, in *Contemporary Socialism,* says that, "according to the reports of the American consuls, nobody in the country thinks any harm of either." But Rae also says: "In Holland, of all countries, the revolutionary element continues [in 1908] the dominant one in the Socialist Party, and in 1894 it was not, as elsewhere, the revolutionists, but it was the parliamentarians, who were expelled from the old Social Democratic Union." In 1894 the present Social Democratic Party was organized on German Marxian principles, by twelve men, who were given the name of "the twelve Apostles." In 1901 there was a split among the Liberals on the suffrage question, the radical wing of the party demanding universal suffrage on the "one man one vote" basis. In the election that year, of the 100 members of the Lower Chamber of the "States General," seven Socialists were elected. There were also elected 11 Liberal Democrats, their programme being universal suffrage, curtailment of the privileges of the rich and the extension of those of the working people, and a more equitable division of wealth. The artist and intellectual classes of Holland have given, as Kirkup expresses it, a "sympathetic reception" to the Socialist movement, but Trade Unionism in Holland has suffered from its identification with Anarchism. In 1905 there was formed a national federation of Trade Unions, to work in harmony

with the newly-organized Social Democratic Party. Until a recent period Holland was almost entirely given to agriculture, but there has been a development of manufacturing, and with it there has been a growth of Trade Unionism, and also of Co-operation, on the Belgian system. In 1905 the Socialists polled 65,743 votes, as against 38,279 in 1901; but they only elected the same number of Socialist members of the "States General"—seven. For years there was a bitter struggle between the Marxists and Revisionists (Opportunists), and at a special Congress held in February, 1909, the latter school won a signal victory. At the election later the Socialist vote was increased. The Marxists (or Tribunists) disgruntled at their treatment by the Revisionists, ran candidates of their own, but they polled only a few votes.

In Switzerland.

The "playground of Europe" and "the model Republic of the world," affords a brilliant vindication of the principles of industrial and political democracy, and at the same time is a practical argument against Revolutionary Socialism. The Swiss are probably the most happily-conditioned people in the world, there being but few very wealthy people and but few very poor among them. There have been more blood-red revolutionary Socialist harangues delivered in Switzerland than in any other country in the world, but they have nearly all been delivered by aliens—exiles from their own lands, who have sometimes abused the hospitality of free little Switzerland. Rae, in *Contemporary Socialism*, says: "The condition of Switzerland shows us clearly enough that democracy under a *regime* of freedom lends no ear to Socialism, but sets its face in entirely different direc-

tions." It is very significant that Socialist writers and speakers seldom refer to Switzerland; and the reason is obvious. The Jesuit joint-authors, Fathers Cathrein and Gettelmann (*Socialism*) say:

> With regard to Switzerland we may repeat what we have written over twenty years ago. Despite the hospitality accorded to foreign Socialists, and despite the greatest freedom of expansion, indigenous Socialism has never come to be of any importance. In 1879, the Socialist ranks numbered up to 15,000; at present the whole party as such amounts at most to 6,000 members. The *Grütliverein*, an association closely allied to Socialism, consisting exclusively of native Swiss, has a membership of 16,000. At the elections for the National Council, 1902, the Socialists returned seven candidates. The total of Socialist votes is estimated at 63,000, but many of them were polled by working men who were not Socialists. The reasons for the slow development of Swiss Socialism are enumerated by G. Adler as being "first, the obstacles in the way of propagandism owing to the want of industrial concentration; secondly, the steadiness of the country's political and social development; finally, the sober and practical character of the nation, which shows great resemblance to the sound and healthy English type."
>
> England and Switzerland afford, therefore, very instructive object lessons. They prove to evidence that wherever Socialism is untrammelled by restrictions, and must take part in practical social reforms, its revolutionary edge is soon blunted.

Since 1887 the Swiss Workingmen's Federation [of Trade Unions] have elected a "Workman's Secretary," who becomes thereby practically a member of the Federal Cabinet, and is paid a salary by the government. It is believed that this is the only instance of this sort of State recognition of organized Labor, although in 1910 the British Government took a partial step in this direction.

Another institution peculiar to Switzerland is the voluntary societies for public utilities—charitable, educational, sanitary, etc. Co-operation is considerably developed, there being about 4,400 societies in 1903. Although Trade Unions have grown of late years, it is said they only include 12 per cent. of the workingmen. The different classes of the citizens, as regards ownership in this world's goods, mix freely, and take part in the many economic and social institutions of the country, and this, with the comparative absence of great wealth and great poverty, prevents the development of a "class-conscious" feeling among the working people as in most other countries. The *Grütliverein* is the oldest Labor organization, it dating from 1838; and it is connected with the Socialist Party. Hunter's *Socialists at Work* practically concedes that the Socialism of this organization is of a mild variety—or at any rate is of the Fabian type: "... As most of its leaders were Liberals, the result has been similar to that in England; the development of a distinctly Socialist party has been comparatively slow." In the opinion of the same writer the practical effect of the "referendum" (which is in operation in Switzerland) is "that the peasant class especially is inclined to be conservative and impatient of politics, and the politician tends to become Opportunist." Still, if *Socialists at Work* is well-informed, the millennium does not exist even in Switzerland. It asserts: "The electoral system is open to much fraud, which is unscrupulously practiced by the capitalist parties to keep the workers from representation in the National Council. At the last election the Socialists assembled 70,000 votes, by which they claim to have won twenty-five seats, but

they were only allowed six. Recent inquiries have been made into the extent of exploitation of child labor, with the appalling revelation that 53 per cent. of the children attending school are also employed in laborious daily work. . . . Capitalism has become intense, and with it an almost savage system of oppression has been instituted by the government." The same work says that Switzerland has become notorious for the frequency with which the soldiery is used against striking workmen.

[This statement leads to the reflection that in the matter of the use of the strong arm of the State against strikers, a Republic is inclined to be more drastic—quicker, sterner, and to use repressive measures more frequently—than is a constitutional Monarchy. For instance: armed force is used much more frequently, and much more relentlessly, in the United States and France against lawless strikers than is the case in England. In connection with this phase of the whole question, it is interesting to note that while theoretically all Modern Socialists are Republicans, yet they are no more favorable to a Republican form of government under the existing "capitalistic system" than they are to a Monarchical system; that is why so many even of the so-called Revolutionary Socialists of England refrain from denouncing the British Royal family. It is a fact that British Socialists frequently declared that King Edward was more of a true Democrat than—say ex-President Roosevelt!]

While most of the Socialism in Switzerland has been taken there by foreign agitators and refugees, there is still a genuine, native Swiss Socialism. In 1873 a People's Association was formed, and also a Workers' Federation; and they both, in 1887, adopted the programme

of Marxian Socialism. In 1884 there was a Social Democratic Party formed, but it collapsed; the present Social Democratic Party (Marxian) was formed in 1888.

In Denmark.

The peculiarity of the Socialism of Denmark is the strong hold it has on the peasantry; and yet Denmark is a country of small peasant proprietors—a condition which it is almost axiomatic to say is opposed to the development of Socialism. Seven-eighths of the whole of Denmark is held by peasant proprietors; but this fact is not an unmixed blessing, as a large number of the proprietors are unable to extract a living out of their holdings, but they will not part with their land; so that, as Rae describes it, there arises a kind of "proprietor-proletariat," and no doubt this is one of the leading causes why Socialism is so attractive to the peasants. As to the condition in the cities and towns, a remarkable official report was made to the British Foreign Office in 1870. This report states that in 1867 one out of every four of the inhabitants of Copenhagen was in receipt of parochial relief. The report goes on to say: "No fact in my report is more certain than that the Dane has yet to learn the meaning of the word *work;* of entireness and thoroughness he has seldom any adequate notion. This is why the Swedish artisan can so often take the bread from his mouth." But the British official (Mr. Strachey) who makes this discouraging report of the Danish artisan, has a far different opinion of the Danish peasant. He declares him to be—since he has been freed from the yoke of the Danish landlord, who was the scourge of the country—"the freest, the most politically wise, the best educated of European yeomen." Social-

ism in Denmark dates from 1871; and in 1872 a branch of the "International" was formed. It is a remarkable fact that in this overwhelmingly Protestant country the International was introduced by two Roman Catholics. They appear to have been a pair of precious rascals, and it is said that they decamped to America carrying with them the funds of the Socialist organization. The Danish "International" then "degenerated" into a simple Trade Union." In 1871 there was started at Copenhagen the *Social Democrat,* and it is flourishing to this day, it having a circulation of between 50,000 and 60,000. The present Socialist organization, the Social Democratic Union, was formed in 1878; it is in close alliance with the German Social Democracy, and it is constitutional in its methods. A peculiarity of it is that it embraces two organizations—one political, and the other economic, the latter being the Socialist Trade Unions. Women take an active part in the Socialist propaganda in Denmark. Ensor (*Modern Socialism*) says that Denmark "leads the Continent in the practical realization of Socialist ideas;" and in the opinion of Robert Hunter, "the Danish Party stands out as one of the sturdiest and best-united sections of the International movement." Trade guilds were abolished in 1857. In 1898 there was established a national system of Trade Unions similar to the American Federation of Labor. There is a most excellent system of pensioning the worthy poor; and Co-operation is extensive, it being on the English Rochdale plan. In 1887 the Socialists polled 8,408 votes; in 1898 they polled 25,019; and in 1901 they polled 41,955. In 1889 they elected one deputy to the *Folkething* (Parliament), out of a total membership of 114; in 1903 they elected 16 deputies; in 1906 they elected 24 to the *Folkething,* and

four to the *Landsting* (the Senate), and polled 76,012 votes; and they also elected 450 Councillors in the different cities and towns, and 400 in the rural communities. Combined with the Radicals, the Socialists now have the majority in Danish local governments. Of all European countries, Denmark is the most advanced in assistance by the State in the sale and export of farm products.

In Norway.

In Norway the Socialists and the Labor Party are virtually one; and this feature is also characteristic of the other Scandinavian countries, Sweden and Denmark. The movement in the three countries, in fact, has a strong bond of sympathy uniting them, and they frequently hold joint conferences. Socialism was introduced into Norway from Denmark in 1873, and a branch of the International was established; and there was a movement towards Socialism during the agitation for a Republic in 1883. But Socialism did not show any vitality in Norway until 1885; two years afterwards the Labor Party was formed, and in 1889 it declared itself for Socialism. In 1897 the Socialist-Labor Party cast only 947 votes; in 1900 it cast 7,440 votes; in 1903 it cast 24,770, and elected four members to the *Storthing* (Parliament), including the only Roman Catholic member of that body; in 1906 the Socialists polled 45,000 votes and elected 10 members of the *Storthing;* in 1901 they elected 31 municipal councillors; in 1904 they elected 74; and in 1906 they elected 330, a number of them being women, who have a qualified right to vote, the suffrage for men being practically universal. It is in its municipal activities that Norwegian Socialism has been mostly

conspicuous. The Socialists were much disappointed at the result of the plebescite on the question of whether their country, on its secession from Sweden, should be a Republic or a Monarchy. The result was: for a Republic, 69,264; for a Monarchy, 259,563. Hunter's *Socialists at Work* narrates this incident: "The subsequent action of the Socialists in voting to welcome King Haakon to Norway was severely criticised throughout the world movement, and to their explanation that it would have been unconstitutional to have voted otherwise after the referendum, the German 'Vorwarts' retorted, 'Since when have Socialists been bound by constitutions?' Eventually it was given as an excuse by the leading Socialist review that the party was very young, and that it must be remembered it had not been built upon an economic foundation as in other countries."

In Sweden.

The main endeavor of the Swedish Socialists so far has been to secure unfettered universal suffrage, and while they have not been wholly successful, they have been able to obtain a considerable extension of the franchise within recent years. The International form of Socialism was introduced into Sweden from Denmark, but it did not thrive, and it drifted into Trade Unionism, which assumed an organized form in 1880. In 1885 the Trade Unions declared for Socialism; in 1898 a national organization of the Trade Unions was formed, and in 1899 this organization formally allied itself with the Social Democratic Party. In 1891 there was a contest between the Anarchists and the Marxians in the party, and the Marxians won. In 1905 a Congress of the Swedish Socialists (the Norwegian Socialists being rep-

resented) declared for the unqualified right of the Norwegian people to manage their own national affairs, and this declaration had a great effect in bringing about a peaceable arrangement between the two countries for separation.

The "general strike" is a characteristic weapon in the hands of the Swedish Labor-Socialists. During August and September of 1909 there was the most extensive demonstration of this character which has occurred in the industrial history of the country. It was precipitated by a "lock-out" on a large scale, that being a not infrequent expedient on the part of Swedish employers when they wish to bring their workmen to terms. At the beginning of August, 80,000 employees were locked out. The National organization of the Trade Unions took up the matter, and it was decided to call a "general strike" as a protest and to cause such a "tie-up" in the country's industrial and commercial affairs as to force employers to abandon "lock-outs" as a policy. The "general strike" took effect August 4th. Out of half a million industrial workers in Sweden, about half belong to Trade Unions; and most of the latter obeyed the order to strike, a notable exception, however, being the railroad men; and many thousands of unorganized workers also joined the strikers. On September 6th the Labor Federation formally "called off" the strike, on the promise of the National Government to make as satisfactory a settlement as possible; but the strike was practically a failure. A noticeable feature of the struggle was the complete absence of violence. Since 1900 the Trade Unionists have increased from 46,000 to 144,000 in 1908. In 1896 the Socialists elected one member to the *Diet* (Parliament) out of a total membership of 230;

in 1905 they elected 15 members, and cast 30,000 votes; and in 1908 they elected 33 members. The fact that there are thousands more of paying members to the Socialist organization than cast Socialist votes, shows the disadvantage under which the Socialists labor in regard to the franchise. The enrolled Socialist vote fell from 112,693 in 1909 to 60,813 in 1910. At the first election under Universal Suffrage, held in September, 1911, there was a notable increase in the Socialist strength in the Second Chamber of Parliament.

Spain and Portugal.

Spain had no Socialist, no representative of the proletariat, in its National Legislature until 1910, when Madrid sent one; but it has for some years back elected a number of Socialist town councillors. Socialism appeared in Spain in 1868, and until 1888 was wholly of the Anarchistic character. In 1873 the "International" had 674 branches and 300,000 members in Spain. The method of progaganda by the Socialists was extraordinary: they usually held their meetings in the churches—God, religion, the priests and the rich being denounced from the pulpits. Rae observes that the revolutionary tradition of Spain has always favored communal autonomy, "but in a country like Spain, where communal property exists already to a large extent, the idea of making all other property communal property lies ever at hand as a ready resource of reformers." Since 1882 there has been a Democratic Labor Party, established on Marxian lines, but its membership has never been great. In Spain the tendency of Socialism is toward extreme Anarchism. But this tendency ought in fairness to be dissociated from the recognized doctrines of Modern

Socialism; it is rather to be considered as a violent protest on the part of Republican Atheists (who, however, are also Socialists) against the Monarchy and the tyrannical system of government. These were the underlying reasons for the bomb outrage against the young King and his English bride as they were returning to the royal palace after the wedding ceremony, and for the other outbreaks, particularly at Barcelona. The court-martial and execution of Prof. Francisco Ferrer in October, 1909, has fanned the flame of fierce discontent, and the present outlook in Spain is very black.

Socialism proper has never been anything but an abstract idea in Portugal, although late reports are to the effect that there is a beginning to the movement. Ever since 1872 there has been an Anarchistic sentiment, and there have been Anarchistic organizations of a limited membership and influence. But the Anarchism of Portugal has been mostly of the philosophical kind—that is, while its adherents advocated the abolition of all organized government, they repudiated physical force as a means of attainment. While the Socialists took part in the establishment of the Republic in 1910, the revolution really had nothing to do with Socialism.

"There is the beginning of a Socialist movement in Greece." Such was an official "International" report in 1909. Its growth has been phenomenal, for in September, 1910, the Socialists elected 10 members to the new National Assembly.

Turkey seems to be the only European country—if it can be so designated—which remains unaffected by the world-sweep of Socialism; and yet, even in Turkey, the seed has been sown.

CHAPTER XII

THE NEW "INTERNATIONAL"

In America there is a general failure to appreciate not only the immanence of Socialism as an active and potential force in this country, but also that it is a stupendous fact as an International movement. Taking each of the countries as a unit, Socialism as an organized force is far and away more thorough, more disciplined, more zealous, more devoted to its objects and the membership more willing to work in season and out of season and to make personal sacrifices for the attainment of those objects, than is the case with any other society, secular, religious, or social, with possibly one exception,—the Catholic Church—and that exception possibly would not apply to the general membership. So, as an International social-political movement, Socialism stands unique: in perfection of detail of organization, in world-wide scope, in enthusiasm, and in unity of purpose, there is nothing to compare with Socialism excepting its great opponent, the Catholic Church.

The old "International," which broke up largely because of the conflict between Marx and Bakounin, between Socialism proper and Anarchism, has been succeeded by the immeasurably more powerful and cosmopolitan Socialist Congress. This new organization dates from July, 1889, when two rival Socialist and Working-

men's Congresses were held at Paris, one being strictly Marxian and the other "Possibilist," or "Fabian Opportunist," the latter including Trade Unionists. Since 1891 the two distinctive schools have met together in one International Congress, practically all phases of the cult being represented with the exception of Anarchists, Trade Unionists and Co-operators being also included—indeed, the new "International" is as much Trade Union as Socialist in its derivation and purpose. This fact is important, as it emphasizes the difference between the old and the new spirit of Socialism. Formerly, Trade Unionists and Co-operators, as such, were looked upon coldly and sometimes were actively opposed by genuine Socialists. Under a standing order the call for the Congress includes all "genuine trade or labor organizations," even "though taking no militant part in politics." At the last Congress this question was threshed out, the old-line British Marxists objecting to representation from the English Laborites; but the claims of the latter were supported by the leaders of the German Social Democracy, and they carried the day overwhelmingly. The practical result of this policy has been to give momentum to the tendency on the part of Trade Unionists and Co-operators throughout the world to embrace the special tenets of Socialism. The eighth and last Congress was held at Copenhagen, Denmark, in September, 1910, and was attended by 887 representatives from 33 nations, the British Section forming the largest of the national groups. Unemployment and Militarism formed the chief topics of discussion. Resolutions in favor of co-operation between Socialists and Trade Unionists were unanimously adopted. As compared with previous International gatherings of Socialists, the Copenhagen Congress

was conspicuously conservative—so much so that it has been criticised by members of the old-line Revolutionary Marxian school. It is a significant fact that in a number of respects the British delegates were more radical than were the German representatives. Three points were conspicuously brought out at this, the largest and most representative body of the proletariat of the world ever assembled: (1) the ever-increasing strength of the Socialist movement in all countries; (2) its growing solidarity; (3) its tendency to substitute practical Opportunism for idealistic Revolutionary "Scientific" Marxian Socialism.

The International Socialist Bureau was instituted in 1900 as the permanent Executive Council of the International Congress, and consists of two representatives from each national delegation to the Congress, together with one representative from the Socialist and Labor Parliamentary Parties of each nation. The Chairman is the brilliant Belgian Socialist, Emil Vandervelde. The Bureau meets annually at Brussels.

In connection with the Congress and the Bureau there are National Committees in each country.

As a development of the Congress there is also an European Socialist and Labor Inter-Parliamentary Committee. Its purpose is to keep the different national Socialist and Labor Parliamentary groups in touch with each other, with the especial object of taking joint action in the event of threatened war between the nations. It is understood that the Inter-Parliamentary groups of Great Britain, France and Germany exchanged views during the "war talk" over Morocco in the summer of 1911. It is well-known that the German Social Democracy—which is the largest political "group" in the

Fatherland—is bitterly opposed to the militarism and belligerency of the Kaiser; and it is not at all unlikely that the Imperial knowledge of this fact had something to do with the modification of the demands of "the War Lord." In the official year-book of the English Labor-Socialists this organization is referred to as possibly possessing "the germ of the future Parliament of the United States of Europe." In 1910, 14 nations were represented on the Inter-Parliamentary Committee.

Numerical Strength of Socialism.

The official year-book of the Socialist-Labor Party of Great Britain for 1911 gives the following as the representation of the Socialists and "Laborites" committed to Socialism in the different Parliaments of the world by the latest returns:

Country	No. of Soc. and Labor Members.	Total Members in Parliament.	Percentage of Soc. and Lab. Members.	Socialist and Labor Votes.
Austria	88	516	17.06	1,041,948
Finland	86	200	43.	316,951
France	76	595	13.01	1,106,947
Germany	53*	397	12.61	3,258,968
Italy	42	508	8.26	338,885
Australia	41	75	54.8	678,012
Great Britain	40†	670	5.97	529,193
Belgium	35	166	21.08	483,241
Sweden	36	165	21.81	75,000

* Eleven seats won since the General Election, 1907.

† General Election, January, 1910. Fewer candidates were run at the last election, December, 1910, and the poll was consequently reduced, though the average vote was higher and the representation increased from 40 to 42.

Country	No. of Soc. and Labor Members.	Total Members in Parliament.	Percentage of Soc. and Lab. Members.	Socialist and Labor Votes.
Denmark	24	114	21.	98,721
Russia	17	442	3.82	———
Norway	11	123	8.94	90,000
Luxemburg	10	48	20.83	———
Greece	10	358	2.8	———
Holland	7	100	7.0	82,494
Switzerland	7	170	4.11	100,000
Turkey	6	196	3.06	———
Chili	6	107	5.6	18,000
Canada	1	213	0.47	———
Servia	1	160	0.62	3,056
Argentine	1	120	0.73	10,000
Spain	1	406	0.24	40,791
United States	1 *	291	0.2	800,000

* One in Congress and 30 in the State Legislatures, elected in 1910.

The two following tables are taken from *The Socialist Annual* (London), for 1911:

The strength of Socialist parties on *Municipal and Communal Councils* is as follows (so far as known):

Country	No. of Socialist Councillors.	Country	No. of Socialist Councillors.
Austria	2,896	Germany	7,729
Belgium	850	Italy	3,139
Bulgaria	?	Norway	873
Denmark	1,000	Servia	22
England	1,126	Spain	150
Finland	351	Sweden	125
France	3,800		

The *Socialist Press* of various countries consists of the following organs:

Country.	No. of Dailies.	No. of Weeklies.	Other Papers.	Women's Papers.	Papers for the Youth	Comic Papers.	Periodicals and Reviews.
Australia	—	2	—	—	—	—	1
Austria (Inclu. Bohemia)	5	30	16	2	2	2	5
Belgium	6	9	11	—	1	—	—
Bulgaria	—	1	3	—	—	—	1
Canada	—	2	1	—	—	—	—
Denmark	35	1	—	—	—	1	1
England	—	11	4	—	1	—	2
Finland	4	1	11	1	1	1	2
France	4	41	3	—	—	—	1
Germany	76	4	6	1	1	1	2
Greece	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Holland	1	14	—	1	1	1	2
Hungary	1	7	4	—	—	—	1
Italy	2	95	5	—	—	1	1
Luxemburg	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Norway	8	3	12	1	1	—	1
Poland	2	3 (a number of secret publications)					2
Portugal	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Roumania	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Russia	—	3 (a number of secret publications)					—
Servia	—	1	2	—	—	—	1
Spain	1	2	5	—	—	—	—
Sweden	8	2	4	1	—	—	1
Switzerland	6	4	7	—	—	—	—
U. S. A.	8	39	8	1	2	—	4

(Since the above table was compiled several new papers devoted to Socialism have started in the United States.)

From the same publication is taken the following table of the number of organized workers in the different countries, according to the latest data available:

Austria (1909)*	484,693	Holland (1909)	145,000
Australia and New Zealand (1908)	239,293	Hungary (1909)	85,266
Belgium (1908)	147,058	Italy (1909)	598,360
Bosnia (1910)	4,470	Norway (1909)	43,199
Bulgaria (1908)	12,933	Servia (1909)	4,800
Croatia (1908)	4,520	Spain (1909)	40,984
Denmark (1909)	120,195	Sweden (1909)	219,000
England (1909)	2,347,461	Switzerland (1908) ..	113,800
Finland (1908)	24,009	U. S. A. (1908)	1,588,000
France (1908)	715,576	About	9,750,000
Germany (1909)†	2,447,578		

* Including nearly 70,000 Czech "Separatists."

† Including 270,751 Christians (Catholics), 108,028 Hirsch-Duncker (Liberal), and 236,132 Independent and Local.

CHAPTER XIII

CONCLUSION: A CRITICISM

The conclusion of the whole matter is that Socialism, in its "ultimate aim," is only a dream. To millions of weary toilers it is as alluring as

"One of those passing rainbow dreams";

but to others it is a spectre of the night—"black, fearful, comfortless and horrible." The convinced Socialist may concede, for the sake of argument, perhaps, that the ultimate goal of his creed is a dream; still he pleads that the dream of to-day is the fact of to-morrow. But dreams are unsubstantial things, and a wise man has said: "Ground not upon dreams, you know they are ever contrary!"

There has never existed a true Socialist State, a Collective Commonwealth; and, judging the future by the past, and giving due consideration to natural law and to human nature, it is safe to say that there never will be one. This does not mean that there will not be attempts made to bring about the thing called Socialism, for "Utopia" still exists in men's imagination. Neither does it mean that many of the "immediate demands" of Socialism are not desirable as well as practicable.

Socialism—that is Collectivism—is bound to prove its

case before any sane-minded nation will make the leap in the dark, although it is quite possible that some countries, through weak, demagogic and foolish politicians, may be drawn perilously near the brink of the precipice.

Most Socialists profess to believe in Darwinism; but the Socialist creed is absolutely opposed to the first principles of Darwin, unless it be held that the fate of the human race is death from dry rot—for that would be the inevitable result of a persistence in Collectivism. The Darwinian law of "the survival of the fittest" may be a cruel one, like the law of death itself, but all the resolutions of the "International" to the end of time will not affect that law one tittle. It is a law of nature that life is a continual struggle from birth to death; without struggle and restless movement there can be no healthy and vigorous life; but Socialism means stagnation, and under natural law there can be only one result—paralysis and death! Socialists appeal to the tribal relations and the village communities as historical proofs of the natural status of the theory of Collectivism; but as pointed out by F. W. Headley in *Darwinism and Modern Socialism*, the old form of tribal and village Socialism did not come in conflict with Darwinian principles: it did not check the elimination of the unfit; while "the new Socialism aims at putting a stop to the struggle for existence altogether. There is to be, if not a luxurious, yet a soft environment for all." If monopoly has stifled individual initiative and enterprise, the remedy is not Industrial Collectivism, but such an adjustment and regulation of affairs as will restore true competition and Individualism, by establishing a relative equality of opportunity. Industrial Collectivism would be more destructive to individual vigor and manly independence and human happi-

ness than is the modern monster Monopoly. Again quoting the author of *Darwinism and Modern Socialism:*

> The history of the human race has been the history of effort, of struggle against difficulties, hardships, and enemies. Socialism, which has been well called the philosophy of failure, means submission to difficulties. It preaches the helplessness of the individual and the omnipotence of the State. The citizens are to be, each of them, so much concrete weakness and helplessness, but somehow the State, though composed of such men and women, is to be, beyond all experience of governments, strenuous and capable. Such a system has only to be tried in its complete form and it must prove at once a disastrous failure.

The progress of Society has been gradual, and the present system has unknown ages back of it; but imperfect as it is, there is no warrant for the assumption that its improvement will, in the main, be along any other lines than those which have gone before; nevertheless, there is ground for the confident hope and expectation that these lines will be straighter and smoother than formerly, and that the rate and extent and scope of the improvements will continually increase. It is proposed by Socialists to substitute for the present long-tested system one that is utterly untried in its fulness of conception, and the partial experiments of which have all finally proven failures, in all ages and under all conditions. In cases where there has been even approximate temporary success in these partial experiments, they have been based on slavery of the body or of the mind—sometimes both—the Socialism of Classic Athens representing the former and that of Utopia the other.

Socialism, in its full concept—as dreamed of by its dev-

otees—can never be a success until human nature has been abolished.

Socialists point to the ever-widening sphere of State activities as a demonstration of the immanence and practicability of Collectivism. But they fail to recognize that to these activities there are limitations, both in nature and degree. Leaving out of consideration such matters as public schools, parks, baths, drainage, etc. (about which there is no controversy), the State or Municipality can only handle with advantage such undertakings as are simple and uniform in their operation and administration, and that are non-industrial.

Furthermore, these undertakings are wholly or substantially to be classed as natural monopolies, such as water, light, carrying the mails, transportation (railways, street cars), or general communication (telegraphs, telephones); and it is to be observed that even some of these, designated as natural monopolies, can be operated by private corporations at least as well as by the State, under certain conditions; and indeed, there are conditions under which it would be very unwise for the State or for Municipalities to undertake their operation. It should be particularly noted that most of the undertakings now operated by the State with a measurable degree of success and satisfaction, belong to a class of necessities or conveniences, or ethical or artistic wants of Society, which are quite apart from Industrialism; and it should be remembered that the argument for Socialism, as regards its economic side, is based entirely on changing the present private industrial system to Collectivism.

Socialists also neglect to note that many of the enterprises in which the State is active are entirely new, not only in form, but in conception and sphere of service.

To a great extent State Socialism, so-called, is not the substitution of communal ownership for private ownership, but is the establishment and operation by the State for the common good of undertakings which had never existed before, many of these being on entirely new ideas of human endeavor, let alone of public activity; and none of these undertakings, it must again be pointed out, are of an industrial, productive nature, properly speaking.

But directly the State or Municipality undertakes industrial productive enterprises it steps outside the limitations of its competency. There is no experience to sustain the contention of Socialists that the State can successfully undertake manufacturing, commercial, or trading enterprises, or even cultivate the land collectively with advantage. All the evidence points the other way. This is true even under the present system of society, where a failure in such an attempt is largely neutralized by the general elasticity of the conditions and the recuperative powers of the community. But under the operations of the proposed Co-operative Commonwealth, there would be no such elasticity or recuperative power. The State machine would be deadly in its destruction of the very mainsprings of human activity and inspiration. Imperfect as is the modern system of Industrialism, it obeys certain natural laws which operate successfully in the main in correcting mistakes; but were Universal Industrialism undertaken by the State, the very vastness of the scheme and the minute and uncountable complicated parts of the mechanism of executive control and administration would inevitably cause the system to be unresponsive to corrective natural laws, and finally to break down.

While the State is ever broadening and increasing its activities, yet it *does not produce wealth;* it simply

spends wealth created under the existing system of so-called Capitalism—of individual enterprise and competition. It is true that Socialists have a list of enterprises which they label "Socialism in the Making"—in which, with triumphant exultation recent State or Municipal undertakings are pointed to as evidence of the practicability of Collectivism. It is to be observed that the great majority of these undertakings come under the category of public benevolences or "public utilities;" and the former are admittedly permanently non-productive and are always drains upon the public treasury, while the latter are examples of State or Municipal Socialism, such as the public ownership and operation of railroads, waterworks, street railroads, etc., which are, in their very nature, monopolies, and which frequently are run at a loss, and oftentimes not so efficiently as similar undertakings are by private corporations. And, by way of passing, it might be remarked that these State and Municipal activities are repudiated by real Socialists as examples of true Collectivism. But very few of the enterprises referred to can be claimed as productive industries; and such as may be claimed so to be, are of the simplest nature, and are all mere experiments, with all the precedents of history against the presumption of permanent success. Of course, there may be occasional instances in which, under abnormal conditions, and particularly under the stress of a sudden unexpected national necessity or calamity, the State might with propriety and even advantage, engage temporarily in an industrial productive enterprise; but even then, experience has shown that the State is not a successful manager of a manufacturing enterprise. Occasionally the State has to avail itself of Martial Law, but the normal condition of every free community must

be under ordinary Civil Law. Socialists can be challenged to produce a single instance of real Industrial Collectivism applied to any complicated modern "socialized" manufacturing enterprise which has stood the test of time. It is impossible to definitely set the limit to the State's activity, but in a general way it may be set down that the State should not invade the field of productive enterprise. This is the major field of human activities; all others are the minor. Notwithstanding the extending field of State and Municipal Socialism, it is safe to say that for all time most of the work of the world will continue to be performed by individuals under private enterprise; although it is quite reasonable to assume that the State will in the future—and in the near future—have more to say as to the relations between the worker and the Capitalist than it now has; and, in addition, it is to be expected and hoped that the day is not far distant when these relations will be so changed and modified by voluntary and unofficial agreement as will make the lot of the toiler much more satisfactory than it is at present.

When Socialists declaim against the alleged tyranny of the present so-called "Capitalistic" Governments, they forget that these very Governments allow them to preach Socialism and to organize to overthrow them; so, also, when they boast of the increasing number of State and Municipal Socialist enterprises they lose sight of the fact that it is the private tax-payers—who get their money through the Capitalistic system—who make possible these examples of Socialism, such as they are. Under Socialism, the well-springs of National prosperity would dry up, and individual pauperism would become universal.

One of the greatest of England's Radicals—a man be-

loved of the common people because of his devotion to their interests—was Charles Bradlaugh. He was pre-eminently a Social Reformer, but he was no Socialist, as the term is now understood. He strenuously took the position, by voice and pen, that Socialism meant National and individual suicide. He pointed out the one great overwhelming objection to the system in saying:

> If Socialism could be realized, then it would be fatal to all progress by neutralizing and paralyzing individual effort, and here I say that civilization has only been in proportion to the energy of individuals.

As civilization has revolted against the old "Manchester school" of extreme Individualism, so it will refuse to accept the other extreme, that of Collectivism; it will distinguish between Social Reform and Socialism.

Modern Socialists are prone to ascribe to the State some mystical omniscience, omnipotence and moral perfection. They ignore the fact that the State is but an instrument, that before the State, the individual was, and that the potentiality and beneficence of the State depend altogether upon the people composing it.

It has been well said that Socialists are ultra-Pessimists as to the present, and ultra-Optimists as to the future. They are blind to the ever-multiplying evidences of amelioration all around them, and are fanatical enthusiasts over the prospects of a coming heaven upon earth founded upon the unsubstantial fabric of a dream. The success of Socialism pre-supposes that human nature will become angelic; but when that time comes, there will be no necessity for Socialism or any other "ism," for mankind will then have left this earth and become inhabitants of Paradise itself.

To a certain class of men, the very indefiniteness of Socialism is an attraction—and some expositors claim that this vagueness is not only a matter of course, but is one of the strong attributes of the theory; but it is a stumbling block to the candid and thoughtful student.

In its economic phase "the alpha and omega" of Socialism is the communal ownership and operation of the means of production, distribution and exchange—or "capital;" but within recent years there has been an appreciation on the part of many of the leaders of the movement of the necessity of conceding that the individual must be allowed to privately own not only natural and manufactured products for his personal use and comfort, and that he must also be permitted to own certain "means of production;" for instance, some Socialists freely admit that a man should be allowed to own a jack-knife, and to use it as a means of production, and that a woman should be permitted to count a needle and even a sewing-machine among her personal property! The one Simon-pure Marxian Revolutionary Socialist who was elected to the British Parliament in the tidal-wave a few years ago was Victor Grayson. At a public meeting during his campaign a "heckler" asked him, "Do you believe in private property?" and his answer was, "I would nationalize the means of production, but a man would keep his tooth-brush and tooth-pick!" The Socialists have been so hard pressed upon this phase of the question, that the necessity of "hedging" has been forced upon them; and the latter-day explanation is that "the means of production" to be owned by the State under Collectivism would be only those that are employed in "socialized" industries—that is, those which require the combined labor of a number of groups of workmen.

But, except in regard to the simplest things, every industrial product is the result of "socialized" labor, to a greater or less extent, in these days of the sub-division of labor. Reflection will clearly show that it is absolutely impossible to draw a line of distinction.

There is equally the same difficulty in the attempt to define and limit what is called "Capital." Any man who possesses anything above his actual needs which another man wants and for which the latter is willing to give anything else (including his labor), is to that extent a "Capitalist." It is claimed that the establishment of the Collectivist Commonwealth would mark the extinction of Capitalism; but the probabilities are that it would be but the beginning of a new craze for private possessions, eventuating in the birth of a new race of capitalists, who would at first operate secretly and in a small way, but would in time openly defy the Commonwealth and branch out on a large scale. They would commence by saving and hoarding, and after a while they would have accumulated a large quantity of excess goods and money,—if the Commonwealth used money—which is a matter much in dispute among Socialists themselves. No law on earth could stop them from doing so,—the history of the Jews under cruel repressive laws demonstrates that—and no law on earth could prevent other men from exchanging their own accumulated goods or money, or even from working for a wage or return in "kind." Hence, there would inevitably be a return to Capitalism and a wage-earning class.

In its very essence, Collectivism, in its full conception, must be monopolistic: the State would, as a matter of necessity, use all of its authority to prevent competition from private individuals; therefore, from purely

economic reasons—apart from others—there would develop a clash between the supporters of the Industrial Commonwealth and those favoring individual enterprise. On the part of Socialists there is a most amazing conviction that when their Collectivist State had been ushered in, there would at once be a cessation to all agitation—that the end of the struggle of mankind to improve their condition had been reached. But ever since man evoluted from the lowest depths of savagery, he has been afflicted with "divine discontent," and there is no reason for supposing that he would lose this characteristic under the reign of King Demos.

In addition to these opposing economic forces, there would inevitably grow up an ever-increasing antagonism to the Socialist State based on the ineradicable love of personal liberty. Individualism would be bound to assert itself. Men would never permanently accept without protest a despotism greater than that of the Russian Czars, merely because it was labelled "Socialism." And the State, to be effective in its role of the Universal, Monopolistic, Exclusive Employer and Boss, would have to be despotic; it could not with safety to its own existence be tolerant to minorities or opposition of any kind; and being despotic, it would work its own doom. In fact, even now, in its attitude toward opposition, Socialism is arrogantly intolerant. Socialists, as a rule, are conspicuous for their unfairness and self-sufficiency in controversy. They allow no one to differ from them.

Even the latter-day "trimming" apologists of Socialism who deny that it has anything to do with religion or ethics, admit or boast that it means far more than a mere change of employers—from the Capitalist to the State. In its full conception, even economically, Collectivism

implies a new and fundamental change in every-day life in the relations of the individual toward other individuals and toward the State, and inversely so. The State would either be a tyrannical task-master or a dole-giver; if the first, it would be hated; in the latter case it would be soon "sucked dry." From either point of view, Collectivism would be bound to collapse—either through assaults from without or through its own inherent weakness and lack of substance.

The natural tendency would be for the Socialist State —the triumphant majority, for the time being—to be despotic and to be indifferent to the views and rights of the minority. No writer in the English language has a greater right to be accepted as an authoritative exponent of pure, unadulterated Marxian Collectivism than Mr. Belfort Bax, and in his *Ethics of Socialism* that gentleman lays it down that—

> The only public opinion, the only will of the majority, which has any sort of claim on the recognition of the Socialist in the present day, is that of the majority of those who have like aspirations with him, who have a definite consciousness of certain aims—in other words, the will of the majority of the European Socialist party.
>
> . . . The practical question finally presents itself: What is the duty of the convinced Socialist towards the present mechanical majority—say of the English nation—a majority mainly composed of human cabbage-stalks, the growth of the suburban villa and the slum, respectively? The answer is, Make use of it wherever possible without loss of principle, but where this is not possible disregard it. The Socialist has a distinct aim in view. If he can carry the *initial* stages towards its realization by means of the count-of-heads majority, by all means let him do so. If, on the other hand, he sees the possibility of carrying a salient portion of his programme by tramping on this majority, by all means let him do this also.

No old fossilized Tory member of the hereditary British House of Lords ever gave expression to such undemocratic sentiments; and yet Mr. Bax is the great literary expounder of the doctrines of the British Social Democratic Party, the repository of the undiluted and untainted full-fledged Marxism!

No class of people are louder in demanding their "rights" than are the Socialists, but this is how they will treat opposition when they get into power, according to another "intellectual" advocate, Prof. Karl Pearson, in *The Ethics of Free-thought:*

> Socialists have to inculcate that spirit which would give offenders against the State short shrift and the nearest lamp-post.

Sidney Webb is accepted in both America and England as entitled to speak for Socialism. He is frank enough to acknowledge (*Fabian Tracts,* No. 51) as to conditions under Collectivism:

> If a man wants freedom to work or not to work just as he likes, he had better emigrate to Robinson Crusoe's island, or else become a millionaire. To suppose that the industrial affairs of a complicated industrial State can be run without strict subordination and discipline, without obedience to orders, and without definite allowances for maintenance, is to dream not of Socialism but of Anarchism.

So, likewise, that even more brilliant Socialist, H. G. Wells (*Fortnightly Review,* November, 1906), controverts the assumption of some enthusiasts that "natural impulses and the native goodness of man" will be sufficient to run the affairs of the Industrial Commonwealth.

Mr. H. M. Hyndman is a graduate of Oxford, is the founder of the British Social Democratic Party, and has given his private fortune and all his life to propagating and defending the principles of Revolutionary Socialism. He does not indulge in the delusion so common among working men that Collectivism is another name for "Liberty Hall," where every man will be permitted to do just as he likes, or do nothing if such be his will, and get well paid for doing anything or nothing. In a lecture in London in 1904 on "Social Democracy," Mr. Hyndman said:

> But do not let us forget that in so far as this tends simply to State control it may mean the control of a bureaucracy and the domination of experts. That entails with it a sort of qualified slavery.
>
> . . . There is no more offensive prig than a bureaucrat, none more wholly impervious to reason when his conceit of himself is threatened.

The learned Prof. Flint, of Edinburgh, is not a Socialist, but he is admittedly a fair critic. He declares (*Socialism*, pp. 373 and 374):

> Socialism of its very nature so absorbs the individual in society as to sacrifice his rights to its authority. . . . It denies to the individual any rights independent of society, and assigns to society authority to do whatever it deems for its own good with the persons, faculties, and possessions of individuals. It undertakes to relieve individuals of what are manifestly their own moral responsibilities, and proposes to deprive them of the means of fulfilling them. It would place the masses of mankind completely at the mercy of a comparatively small and highly centralized body of organizers and administrators entrusted with such powers as no human hands can safely or righteously wield.

Dr. Schäffle, the Austrian economist, whose *Quintessence of Socialism* is a classic accepted by Socialists themselves, points out in that remarkable exposition of Marxism that under Collectivism (which he afterwards demonstrated was an impossibility)—"The producers would still be, individually, no more than workmen. . . . The only difference would be that they would be completely at the mercy of their foremen."

The individual would find that not only would he be limited to one employer—the State, or the Collective Commonwealth, or the Committee of Administration of Things, or whatever might be the name of the Communal authority—but that his personal liberty was all gone. He would be labelled and numbered and barracked; he would be shorn of all individuality; he would be watched, reported upon, registered and inspected; his goings out and incomings would all be recorded; he would have to accept whatever uniform the Bureau on Dress prescribed for him; he would have to take lean meat when he wanted fat, and mutton when he preferred beef; if he desired a change of climate he would have to make dutiful request for it, and would not dare to go away unless he secured permission; he would have to work in a foundry when he wanted to be a carpenter; he would be discontented because his neighbor had a better house to live in than the Committee had assigned to him; he could not own anything without a license; he could not do an odd job to earn a little extra money; he would not be allowed to trade off or sell anything; he could not do anything of his own free will except—*Revolt!* And revolt he would. The pendulum would swing from the slavishness of Collectivism to the unrestrained freedom of absolute Individualism—Anarchy! And if he failed

in his rebellion, Absolutism would be enthroned. Such would be the ultimate end of Socialism!

Socialism is an impossibility for two reasons—and many others might be named, but these are sufficient:

(1) *It could never be established.* The wisest of Marxians have utterly failed—some admittedly—to elucidate how the private productive property of a nation could be turned into collective property; and it should be kept in mind that according to its very nature, Socialism, even from a theoretical standpoint, must be world-wide to be logical and successful. If the State attempted the transfer of property or capital by confiscation there would be civil war; if it attempted honest payment, bankruptcy would follow.

(2) *It could never be administered.* The State would be utterly unable to keep the gigantic machinery of modern Industrialism going. No official bureau would be vast enough or efficient enough to do the bookkeeping required, to decide upon the quantity and quality, the nature and style of the different products, and to meet the infinite variety of tastes and necessities of the citizens. Neither could any Collectivist system be devised to satisfactorily assign labor according to its ability or preference, or to provide for its equitable compensation. It is inconceivable that there would not be favoritism in assignments to labor; and there would inevitably be inequality and injustice in compensation.

There is no force in the Socialist reply to these objections, that citizens now-a-days have satisfactory relations with the State in regard to official positions: for they enter the Government service of their own free-will and

accord, and if they do not like it they are at perfect liberty to resign and to enter the service of a private individual or a private corporation; but under Collectivism there would be only one employer, one buyer of Labor—the State; and if the citizen were unsatisfied with either his assignment to labor or his compensation, he would have no remedy, as there would be no position open to him outside the State.

But even though Collectivism in its full conception could be established and administered, it would be a calamity past description. It would be contrary to and eternally antagonistic to human nature. All Individualism would be killed; the private understanding and conception of things would be absolutely destroyed; and the individual would become the mere creature, the slave, of the State. There could be no appeal from Cæsar: Whatever the State decreed, that the citizen must do; instead of the State being an aggregation of individual units, it would be One Indivisible Whole, composed of indistinguishable human atoms; the State would be the Monopolistic Task-master and Employer—the Universal Buyer and Seller, the Arbiter of Fashion, and the Sole Custodian of Life and Liberty. All individual freedom would be gone, for the State would not—and could not for its own safety—tolerate any interference with its absolute and sovereign prerogatives. To protest peaceably would be impossible, for the State would own all the printing presses, type and paper, and the other accessories of publication; and the State would never permit its own property to be used for its own destruction. Necessarily, no book, no magazine, no pamphlet, no newspaper, no leaflet, could be printed without having passed the govern-

ment censor; and the same is true of all messages by the telegraph and telephone systems, for the State would own all these.

Ethically, the establishment of Socialism would be the greatest misfortune which could overtake the human race. It would entirely extinguish all those qualities which have distinguished the most progressive and civilized nations: individuality, personal responsibility and independence, the spirit of self-help and self-reliance, thrift, industry, initiative, enterprise, persistence, ambition, hope, patriotism, courage. It would make of the citizens a horde of lazy, hopeless and dissatisfied paupers, as already is the tendency manifesting itself under the operation of the dole-giving poor-law and non-contributory pension system now in full blast in England. There the working class have become inoculated with the wretched and character-destroying poison that the State is the Universal Provider. A nation which adopts this as its ideal must inevitably perish from the face of the earth, and deservedly so. It would likely starve to death, or its people would become the under-strappers or even slaves of some strong race which had retained the attributes of real virile manhood; or it would find its fate in a cataclysm of Civil War and Anarchy, ending in a Military Absolutism!

All this is on the assumption that the effects of Socialism would be merely economic. But let the Collective Commonwealth be such as that contemplated by Marx and his disciples: then religion would be banished from the earth; then the fear and love of God would be no more; gone would be the hope of Immortality; and not

even the sweet relationship of man and wife and parent and children, as now understood, would be left.

Yet Socialism has its good side, although with characteristic effrontery it appropriates to itself as its peculiar possession attributes and forces which have been in beneficent operation through the long centuries by men who never heard of Socialism, and by agencies which have always had the scorn and even hatred of the greatest of Socialists, from Marx and Engels to Bax and Bebel.

Nevertheless, Socialism, extravagant and impracticable though it be, has played a great part and is entitled to its share of credit in the ever onward and upward movement, limited to no class, no creed, no nationality, no theory of government or economics, for the amelioration of the lot of the sons of toil, the righting of wrong wherever found, and the uplifting of the race to higher planes of life in all its aspects.

But, as an universal condition of Society, as a panacea for present evils, as the hope of the proletariat, Socialism, in its complete conception, is an absolute and a hideous impossibility.

(FINIS)

INDEX

ABORIGINAL COMMUNISM, 49, 50.
Abusiveness of Socialists, 20.
Agrarian laws of Romans, 52.
Aimé, Victor, father of German Christian Socialism, 132.
Aked, Rev., 129.
Alliance, Socialist Trade and Labor, 85.
"Allmend," the Swiss, 61.
"Alpha and Omega" of Socialism, 21, 37, 322.
Altgeld, Gov. John P., 196.
American Federation of Labor; see Federation of Labor.
American Institute of Christian Sociology, 129.
American Political-Labor Movements, 75-78.
American Railway Union, 186.
American Socialism, 22-30; history of, 176-191; State Socialism, 111-113; Christian Socialism, 127-130; German-Americans, 178, 179; "International," 179-183; Socialist Labor Party, 183-186; Socialist Party, 186-191; present outlook, 200-202.
Anabaptist Communists, 90.
Anarchism, varieties of, 43; compared with Socialism, 42, 43; in America, 192-200; see also Russian Socialism.
Anarchists, schools of, different, 43.
Ancient Lowly, The, 54, 57-59.
Ancient Socialism, 49-63.
Anglican Church and Socialism, 122, 123.
Anti-Combination laws, 68.
Anti-Socialist movement, 16, 17, 252-259.
Atheism and Socialism, 127, 128, 189; Bebel on, 166; see also Ethics, Economics, Family and Religion.
Athenian Socialism, 55-59, 91, 316.
Atlantis, New, Bacon's, 88.
Austrian Socialism, 279-282.
Aveling, Dr., son-in-law of Marx, 279.
Aztecs, Communism among the, 59.

BABEUF, FRANÇOIS NOEL, Communism of, 275, 276.
Bacon, Lord; his *New Atlantis*, 88.
Baden-Powell, B. H.; on communal land ownership, 51.
Bakounin, the Russian Anarchist, 182, 227, 286, 287, 307.
Ball, John; the first English Socialist, 210-213.

Baptists and Socialism, 128, 129.
Bax, E. Belfort; on definitions of Socialism, 35-41; his denunciation of Fabianism, 40, 41; on the catastrophic theory, 158; on Socialism and marriage, the family and ethics, 166-168; the will of the majority, 325.
Beaulieu, Paul Leroy; a critic of Marxism, 274.
Bebel, Ferd. August; his definition of Socialism, 38; modification of his views, 136; on French Commune, 208; career, 267, 268.
Beesley, Prof. E. S., 226, 230.
Belgium Socialism; Christian, 134; Revolutionary, 291-294.
Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, 35, 89, 171; his "Nationalism," 89, 90.
Berger, Victor, first Socialist Congressman, 29, 177.
Bernstein, a critic of Marxism, 145, 272, 274.
Besant, Mrs. Annie, Agnostic and Socialist, 46, 190, 231, 249, 309.
Bible, the, and private property, 51, 52.
"Bible of Socialism, The," 137.
Bismarck; his State Socialism, 36, 102, 103, 271; coercive measures, 270, 271.
"Black Death," the, 212.
Blane, Louis, the first State Socialist, 276, 277.
Blatchford, Robert; his description of ideal Socialism, 45; his fear of German invasion, 230.
Bliss, Rev. Dr.; his definition of Socialism, 37; on Athenian Socialism, 55, 56; pioneer American Christian Socialist, 128; on Scientific Socialism, 140, 143.
Bouche de Fer, first Socialist paper, 133.
Bradlaugh, Charles, on Socialism, 5, 231, 321.
"Brethren of the Common Life," 90.
Briand, M., French Premier, 278, 279.
Brisbane, Albert, a follower of Fourier, 95.
British Socialism, 203-259; Opportunist, 22; politics and Trade Unionism, 65-69; Trades Disputes Act, 69, 71, 72; Labor revolt of 1911, 72-75; State Socialism, 106-110; Christian Socialism, 123-126; characteristics, 203-207; its origin, 207-210; John Ball, the pioneer, 210-213; the "Industrial Revolution," 213-215; the "Luddites," 215-217; the "Chartists," 217-223; the "International," 223-227; "Social Democratic Federation," 227-236; "Fabianism," 236-239; Independent Labor Party, 239-244; Labor Party, 244-248; Trade Unionism submerged by Socialism, 248-252; has Socialism been halted? 252-256; the anti-Socialist movement, 256-259.
"Brook Farm," 96.
"Brotherhood of the Kingdom," 128, 129.
Bureau, the International Socialist, 190, 249, 291, 309.
Burns, John, Labor member of the British Cabinet, 231.

CABET, ÉTIENNE; his "Voyage in Icaria," 88, 89; Utopian experiment, 89; holds that Christianity is Communism, 133.
Campanella's *City of the Sun*, 88.
Capital, Marx's, 21, 37, 137-139, 144, 146, 210.
Capital under Socialism, 323.
Capitalism; commencement of, 68, 214; the Marxian view of, 145-154.
"Catastrophic Theory," 23, 158, 159, 272.
Catholic Church and Socialism, 59, 90, 121, 122, 130-132, 307.
Cathrein, Victor, Jesuit critic, 92, 275.
Chambly, Comte de, 133.
"Chartists," 123, 208, 217-223.
Chicago Anarchists, 193-197.
Christianity and Socialism, 58, 127, 128, 133, 134.
Christian Sociology, Institute of, 129.
Christian Social Union, 125, 128.
Christian Socialism, 22, 121-134; the churches and, 121; in England, 123-126; in America, 127-130; Continental, 130-134.
Christian Socialist League, National, 130.
Christian Socialists, Society of, 128.
Churches and Socialism, 121-123, 126.
Clarke, Wm., on manager and capitalist, 148, 149.
Classes, under Socialism, 45-47.
"Class Consciousness," 22, 25, 27, 29, 68, 73, 74, 77, 177, 185, 200, 211, 271.
Clemenceau, M.; his opinion of the English working-class, 252.
Collectivism, 21, 23, 36, 37, 103, 145, 146, 149, 150; how will it be established? 154, 161; never a true Collectivist State, 62, 63, 314; destructive to individualism, 315, 316, 327, 328; impossibility of establishing and administering, 329-332.
Combinations; industrial, 28, 153, 188, 189; labor, 69.
Common lands, 60-62.
Commons, Prof. John Rogers, 129.
Communism; compared with Socialism, 42-45; "the final goal of Socialism," 48; aboriginal, 49, 50; Marx on, 46-48; in Ireland, 60, 61.
Communist League, 225, 226.
Communist Manifesto, of Marx and Engels, 44, 78, 136, 137, 144, 148, 161, 165, 225.
Compensation, question of, 45-48, 269, 270.
Confiscation, under Socialism, 109, 157, 158.
Congressional grants, socialistic, 112.
"Constructive" Socialism; see Fabianism and Opportunism.
"Consumption" goods, 44, 45.
Continental Socialism, 64, 260-306; Christian, 130-134.
Co-operation; Owen's schemes, 32; Christian Socialist, 123-125; in Belgium, 292, 293; Holland, 295; Switzerland, 298; Denmark, 301.

Co-operative Commonwealth; see Collectivism.
Coulanges, Fustel de, refutes Laveleye's theories, 51.

Darwinism and Socialism, 315.
"Davidists," 90.
Davidson, Thomas; his relation to the foundation of Fabianism, 237.
"Death Duties" (British), 109, 110.
Debs, Eugene V., American Socialist leader, 186, 187, 190, 205.
Definitions of Socialism, 34-38.
De Leon, Daniel, Revolutionary Socialist leader, 205.
Democracy of America, Social, 186.
Democratic Federation, Social (English), 228-236.
Democratic Party, Social; see Socialist Party—American.
Denmark, co-ownership in, 61; Socialism in, 300-302.
Diderot on the Russian people, 285.
Different Kinds of Socialism, 20-22, 34, 35.
Diocletian, the destroyer of Solonic Socialism, 59.
Distribution of Labor's products; see Wages under Socialism.
Dorians, institutions of the, 54.

Economics, Socialism not limited to, 161-170.
"Economic Determinism"; see "Materialistic Conception of History."
"Economy," Community of, 99.
Eight hours, 179, 194, 197, 232, 242.
Ely, Prof. R. T., on materialism of Socialism, 19, 20; on Marx's theory of values, 141, 142; on Lassalle, 267; Louis Blanc's failure, 276, 277.
Engels, Friedrich, co-founder with Marx of Scientific Socialism; compiler of *Capital*, 21, 138, 139; on English Opportunism, 23, 206; Communism, 44; German-American Socialism, 22, 23; gives credit to Marx, 135; on Capitalism, 148; presents the "Marginal Notes," 272.
England, Municipal Socialism in, 114; "Industrial Revolution" in, 213-215; see also British Socialism.
England, Church of, and Socialism, 122-126; see also Christian Socialism.
English Opportunism; Engels on, 22, 23; see also Fabian Socialism.
English Origin of Socialism, 31, 32, 207-210.
Episcopal Church, Protestant, and Socialism, 122, 128; see also Christian Socialism.
Equality, Bellamy's, 89.
Equality of remuneration under Socialism, 45-48.
Erfurt Platform, 272.
Ethics and Socialism, 15-20, 38, 161-170, 189, 235, 331.
Evans, the brothers, 75.
Evolutionary theory, 135-137.
Experimental Utopianism, 90-101.

"FABIAN ESSAYS," 148; Spargo on, 39, 40.
Fabian Socialism, 22, 24, 36, 39, 41, 204, 236-239.
"Familists," 90.
Family, the; private property and, 50; under Socialism, 17, 20, 50, 51, 161-166, 189, 235, 331.
Farmers' Alliance, 77.
Fauchet, Claude, 133.
Federation, Democratic (English), 228.
Federation of Labor and Socialism, 42, 78-85.
Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, early German Socialist, 263.
Finland, Socialism in, 290, 291.
Fischer, Adolph, Chicago Anarchist, 195, 196.
Flint, Prof. Robert, on definitions of Socialism, 34, 36; on Lassalle's Law of Wages, 267; on individualism under Socialism, 327.
Fourier; his Utopian schemes, 93-97.
Frazier, J. G., on Athenian Socialism, 56, 57.
French Socialism; Christian, 133, 134; Revolutionary, 275-279.
"Fundamentals," the Marxian, 135-137.

GALL, HEINRICH LUDWIG, the first German Socialist, 263.
Gapon, Father, 288.
Garibaldi, 283.
Gary, Judge, on the Chicago Anarchists, 197.
George, Henry, on Socialism, 17; his land tax theory, 78, 227.
German Labor Association (American), 181.
German "Marke," the, 62.
Germany, Socialism as a product of, 224.
German Socialism, 22, 132, 133, 260-275.
German State Socialism, 102-104.
Gibbons, John, LL.D., on private property, 53.
Glasier, J. Bruce, editor of the *Labor Leader* (England), 244.
Gompers, Samuel, and Socialism, 5, 79-81, 85.
"Gotha Programme," 46, 143, 144, 269, 272.
Grayson, Victor, Marxian M. P., 234; on private property under Socialism, 322.
Greece, Socialism in, 306; see also Athenian Socialism.
Green, John Richard, on John Ball, 211.
Greenback Party, 78.
Guilds, ancient trade, 66, 214, 215; Belgian, 293.
Guild of St. Matthew, 125, 229.

HAMMURABI, Code of, 52, 53.
Hanna, Mark, on the coming conflict, 30.
Harcourt, Sir William, on Socialism, 35.
Hardie, Keir; his orthodoxy questioned, 42, 201; on Communism, 48; founder of Labor Party, 241, 243, 244; member of Parliament, 247; on the "class struggle," 240.
"Harmonists" (or "Harmonites"), 32, 94, 98.

"Haymarket" Anarchists, 183, 192-197.
Headlam, Rev. Stewart; founder of the Guild of St. Matthew, 231.
Headley, F. W., on the new Socialism, 315, 316.
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm, German philosopher, 263.
"Henry Georgeism," 78, 227.
Herron, Prof. G. D., 129, 130.
Hertzen, Alexander; Russian Socialist, 285; his renunciation of Nihilism, 286, 287.
Hillquit, Morris; his criticism of Samuel Gompers, 80; of the Federation of Labor, 83-85; on Marx's theory of values, 142, 143; the establishment of Collectivism, 157; on the "time-basis" of payment, 173-175; on Lassalle, 267.
Holland, Socialism in, 294-296.
Huber, Victor Aimé; social reformer, 263.
Huet, Prof. François; Belgian Christian Socialist, 134.
"Humanitarianism," 34.
Human nature and Socialism, 316, 317, 321, 324, 330.
Hungarian Socialism, 279-282.
Hunter, Robert, on Italian Socialism, 282.
Hyndman, Henry Mayers; leader of British Marxism, 229, 230, 233, 234; preaches "class hatred," 74; opposes English Labor Party, 250, 252; on conditions under Socialism, 327.

Icarian Movement, Cabet's, 88, 89, 97.
Ideal Communism, 90-101.
Impossibility of Social Democracy, Schäffle's, 282.
Income Tax (British), 109.
Independent Labor Party (British), 239-244.
India, communal villages in, 51.
Individualism, 34; under Socialism, 324, 327, 328, 330, 331.
Individual rights, Anarchistic idea of, 42.
Industrial Commonwealth; see Collectivism.
"Industrial Revolution," 27, 150-161, 213-223.
Industrial Trusts; see Combinations.
Initiative, Referendum and Recall, 188, 232.
Institute of Christian Sociology, 129.
Insurance, workmen's, 103-108, 114, 188.
Insurrectionary Communism, 24, 25.
"Insurrection, the Welsh," 221.
"Intellectual Opportunists"; see Fabian Socialism.
International Socialism, 38, 84, 181, 187, 224, 225, 249, 250, 307; see also Marxian Socialism.
"International," the; in America, 179-183; its origin, 225-227; in England, 223-227; the new, 249, 250, 307-310.
Internationalist Socialist Bureau, 190, 249, 309.
Internationalist Socialist Review; criticism of the British Labor Party, 201, 202.
Inter-Parliamentary Committee, 309, 310.

Intolerance of Socialists, 20, 192, 245, 324-327.
Ireland; ancient common property in, 60; strike in, 73; Socialism in, 203, 248.
"Iron Economic Law," Lassalle's, 266, 267.
Italian Socialism, 282-284.

JAPAN, Socialism in, 60.
Jaurès, Jean Léon, a critic of Marx, 274.
Java, collective ownership in, 62.
Jesuits, their Paraguayan "reductions," 90-92.
Jevons on Value, 140.
Journals, abusiveness of Socialist, 20.

KAPITAL, DAS, Marx's; see *Capital.*
Kantsky, compiler of Marx's works, 21; on compromise, 206; a strict Marxian, 272, 274; supports the English Labor Party, 250.
Kettler, von, Bishop, founder of German Catholic Christian Socialism, 132.
Kingsley, Charles, and the Chartists, 123-125, 132, 218.
Kirkup, Thomas; his view of values, 144; on the Chartists, 217; on the "Iron Law," 267.
Knights of Labor, 77, 78, 85.

LABOR, as the source of wealth, 32, 208, 269; see also Values.
Labor and Socialism, 17, 25-29, 64, 65; see also Trade Unionism.
Labor combinations, 69.
Labor, Federation of, and Socialism, 78-85.
Labor, Knights of, 77, 78, 85.
Labor, Marxian theory of; see Values.
Labor National Union, 76, 77, 179.
Labor platform, first American, 76.
Labor Party (English), 243-248, 250, 251.
Labor Party, Independent (English) 239-244.
Labor Party, Socialist (American), 183-186.
Labor-Political Movement (American), 75-78; the start in England, 69.
Labor Reform Party, 180.
Labor Representation (Legislative); see Parliamentary Representation.
Labor Representation Committee (English), 71, 243, 244.
Labor revolt of 1911 (English), 72-75.
Labor under serfdom, 68, 69.
Laborers, statutes of, 67-69.
Lafargue, M.; his definition of Socialism; his suicide, 279.
Lamennais, Abbé de, 133.
Land, ancient Communism in, 51-54, 60-62.
Land "Nationalization," 78; see also State Socialism.
Land Values; see "Henry Georgeism."

Lassalle, Ferdinand, "father of Social Democracy," 264-267.
Laveleye, Emile de; on land ownership, 51; his opinion of Huet, 134.
League, National Christian Socialist, 130.
"League of the Just," 224.
League, Communist, 225, 226.
Le Rossignol, Prof.; on inequality of man, 49; on Marx's conception of history, 140.
Leroux, Pierre, and origin of word "Socialism," 34.
Lesseps, Vicomte de, 93.
"Libertines," 90.
Liebknecht, Wilhelm; on the wage system, 156; one of the founders of Marxism, 267, 268.
Lingg, Louis, Chicago Anarchist, 196.
London Municipal Society; anti-Socialist, 258.
Los Angeles *Times*, dynamiting of, 191, 199, 200.
Looking Backward, by Bellamy, 89, 171.
"Luddites," the, 215-217.
Lycurgus, his division of land, 54.

McNAMARA OUTRAGES, 199, 200.
McNeill, George E.; founder of the K. of L. and A. F. L., 77.
"Made in Germany," Socialism as, 224.
Magna Charta, 67.
Maine, Sir Henry; his theory as to land ownership, 51.
Maison du Peuple, 293.
Majorities and Socialism, 325.
Man, The, first American Labor paper, 75.
Mann, Tom; on solidarity of Labor, 74; leader of English labor outbreak, 231.
"Marke," the German, 62.
Marriage, 50, 51; see also Ethics and Religion.
Marx, Karl; "father of Modern Socialism," 31; his definition of Socialism, 36; author of *Communist Manifesto*, 43, 44; and of *Capital*, 137-139; on remuneration under Socialism, 46-48; his theory of Surplus Value, 146; on Capitalism, 148; on the Industrial Revolution, 150-154; his genius, 208; on the English people, 228; on Labor as the source of wealth, 269; his daughters, 279.
Marxian Socialism, 135-175; in America, 23; specifically, 35; the orthodox kind, 39-42; neither Anarchism nor Communism, 42-44; the "fundamentals," 135-137; evolutionary theory, 137; theory of Values, 141-147; Capitalism, 147-149; Collectivism, 149, 150; the "Industrial Revolution," 150-161; as affecting religion and the family, 161-166; involves ethics, 166-170; as to reward of labor, 170-175.
"Materialistic Conception of History," 18-20, 135-137.
Matthew, St. Guild of, 125.
Maurice and Kingsley; Christian Socialists, 123-125, 218, 222.

Mazzini, 283.
"Means of production," 38.
Merrie England, Blatchford's, 40.
Mexico, Communism in, 59.
Middle Ages, condition of Labor in the, 210.
Mill, John Stuart; his definition of Socialism, 37; opinion of Fourierism, 96, 97; how he was affected by French Socialism, 275.
Milwaukee elects a Socialist Mayor, 29.
Miners, Western Federation of, 198; English Federation, 249.
Minimum wage, 67.
Minorities, rights of, 42.
"Mir," the Russian, 61, 62, 286.
Mitchell, John, and "Wage Slavery," 79, 80.
"Modern" Socialism; its beginning, 215; see Marxian Socialism.
Monarchism and Socialism, 299, 303, 306.
Money under Socialism, 45, 175, 323.
Morality and Socialism, 15-20; 161-166, 189, 235, 331; see also Ethics and Religion.
Morelly, French revolutionary philosopher, 275.
More's *Utopia*, 35, 87.
Morris, William, the artist-poet of Socialism, 40, 41; ridicules Marx's "catastrophic theory," 158; on John Ball, 213; founder of the Socialist League, 235; see also Bax.
Moyer-Haywood murder case, 197-199.
Most, John, Anarchist, 194.
Municipal Socialism, 36, 105; in England, 114-119; see also State Socialism.
Municipal officials, Socialist, 311.
Mun, Comte de; Catholic Christian Socialist, 133.

"NATIONALISM," Bellamy's, 89.
Nationalization of railroads, etc.; see State Socialism, and Collectivism.
National Christian Socialist League, 130.
National Labor Union, 76, 77, 179-181.
National Reform Party, 180, 181.
"National Workshops" (French), 276.
"Needs, to each according to his," 48; the Athenian rule, 55; Hillquit on, 174, 175; see also Compensation.
New Atlantis, by Lord Bacon, 88.
"New Christianity," Saint-Simon, 93.
"New Fellowship," 237.
"New Harmony," 94, 98.
"New Trade Unionism, The," 65.
Newspapers under Socialism, 89, 330.
Niebuhr, Prof., on agrarian laws, 52.
Nieuwenhuis, Rev. F. D., founder of Dutch Socialism, 294.
Nihilism, Russian, 284, 285.

Norway, Socialism in. 302, 303.
Noyes, John Humphrey, founder of the Oneida Community, 98.

O'Connell, Daniel, and the "Chartists," 219.
O'Connor, Feargus, leader of the Chartists, 218-222.
Ohio, Socialist gains in, 191.
Old-age pensions; German, 102, 103; British, 107, 108; in America, 114, 118.
Olivier, Sir Sidney, a Socialist Governor, 231.
Oneida Community, 98-100.
"Opportunism," 22, 23, 36, 204; see also Fabian Socialism.
Organized Labor; see Federation of Labor, and Trade Unionism.
Origin of the word "Socialism," 34.
Origin of Modern Socialism, 207-210, 215, 217; see also Robert Owen.
"Orthodox" Socialism, 19, 39-42.
"Osborne decision," 66.
Owen, Robert, "father of Modern Socialism," 30-33; pioneer of Utopianism, 93, 94, 215.

Paraguay, "reductions" of, 90-92.
Parliamentary, Inter-, Committee, 309, 310.
Parliamentary representation, 28, 29, 71, 177, 243-248, 309-311.
Parsons, Albert R., Chicago Anarchist, 183, 194-196.
Pauperism, universal, under Socialism, 331.
Pawnshop, municipal, 115, 116.
Pearson, Prof. Karl; on offenders against the Socialist State. 326.
"Peasants' Revolt," 211-213.
"People's Charter"; see "Chartists."
"Perfectionists," 98, 99.
Pericles, Socialism under, 55-57.
Personal liberty under Socialism, 324-328.
Peru, Communism in, 59.
"Phalanxes" of Fourier, 94-97.
"Picketing," 71, 75.
Plato's *Republic*, 35, 86, 87.
Poland, 291.
Political-Labor movement (American), 75-78.
Poor Man's Guardian; first publication to use the word "Socialism," 34.
Populist Party, 89, 177.
Portugal, Socialism in, 306.
Postal Savings Banks, 112.
Potash trade (German), socialistic scheme as to, 274, 275.
Potter, Beatrice, on the "Chartists," 219.
Powderly, Terence V., 85.

Press, Socialist; abusiveness of, 20, 187, 195; extent of, 312; no free, under Socialism, 330.
Primitive society, 49, 50.
Private property; under Anarchism, 42, 43; the family and, 50-53; the Bible and, 51; Proudhon's declaration as to, 277; under Socialism, 322.
"Production" goods, 44.
Proletariat, the; in America, 25, 28; in Europe, 27; in ancient days, 58; Marx on, 152, 156; coming of, 214; of the world, 309.
Providential intervention, denial of, 165.
Protective tariff, 112.
Protestant (German) Christian Socialism, 132, 133.
Protestantism and Socialism, 121-123, 126, 128, 211.
Proudhon, Pierre Joseph; his definition of Socialism, 35; his ideal society, 277, 278.
Public Ownership; see State Socialism, and Collectivism.
Public utilities, and Socialism, 111-120, 319; see also Collectivism, and State Socialism.

QUELCH, HENRY; Revolutionary Socialist, 231, 234, 235.
Quintessence of Socialism, Schäffle's, 37, 282.

RAE, PROF., on Municipal Ownership, 114, 115; Marxian theory of Values, 145.
Railroads, public and private ownership of, 113, 114.
Railway Union, American, 186.
"Rappists," 94, 100, 101.
"Reductions" of Paraguay, 90-92.
Referendum, Initiative, and Recall, 188, 190, 232; in Switzerland, 298; in Norway, 303.
Reform, Social, as distinct from Socialism, 78, 132, 294, 320, 321, 332.
Religion and the family, 15-20, 161-166, 189, 235, 331; see also Family.
Remuneration under Socialism, 45-48, 269, 270.
Representation, legislative; see Parliamentary representation.
Republic of Plato, 35, 86, 87.
Republican Party and Socialism, 111, 112.
"Revisionists," 272, 296.
Revolution, immanence of, 24, 25.
Revolutionary Socialism, 22-25; see also Marxian Socialism, and Collectivism.
Reybaud and the word "Socialism," 34.
Ricardo; English political economist, 144, 207, 208.
"Right to work," 102, 103, 189, 204, 276.
Rodbertus, Johann Karl; pioneer Socialist, 263, 264.
Rogers, Thorold; statistician-economist, 210.

Roman Agrarian laws, 52.
Roman Catholic Church and Socialism; see Catholic Church.
Romantic Socialism, 86-90.
Roosevelt, Ex-President, on Socialism, 15, 17, 18, 20; as a State Socialist, 111; on "undesirable citizens," 199.
Rosebery, Lord, on Socialism, 15.
Russia, the "Mir" in, 61; Municipal Socialism in, 61, 119, 120; Revolutionary Socialism in, 284-291.

St. Matthew, Guild of, 125.
Saint-Simon; founder of French Socialism, 92, 93, 133.
Schäffle, Dr.; his definition of Socialism, 37; on Surplus Value, 147; on establishment of Collectivism, 157; as exponent and critic of Socialism, 281, 282.
Schools, varying, of Socialism, 20-22.
"Scientific" Socialism; see Marxian Socialism.
Scope of Socialism, 18-20.
Scotland and Socialism, 240, 241.
Sectarian Communism, 92, 97-101.
Secular Utopianism, 92-97.
"Separatists," 98.
Serfdom, labor under, 68, 69; Russian, 285.
Sexual relations; see Family.
Shaftesbury, Lord, "the workingman's friend," 31.
"Shakers," 98.
Shaw, Bernard, on the Marxians, 21, 39; leader of the Fabians, 231; on Fabianism, 237.
"Single tax"; ancient Japanese institution, 60; see also "Henry Georgeism."
Skidmore, Thomas; his agrarian preamble, 176.
Slavery; under Athenian Socialism, 55, 56, 58, 63; in England, 67-69, 212; under Collectivism, 327, 328, 330.
Socialism; what is it? 34-48; relation to religion and morality, 15-20, 161-166, 189, 235, 331; "purified," 20; variety of schools of, 20-22; one cardinal doctrine of, 21; in America, 22-24, 26-30, 176-202; origin of the word, 34; Revolutionary, 24, 25, 42-44; definitions of, 34-38; orthodox, 39-42; Anarchism, Communism, and, 42-44, 47, 48; ancient, 49-63; Athenian, 55-57; the "Solonic Law," 57-59; and the Federation of Labor, 78-85; and Trade Unionism, 25, 26, 64-85; Utopian, 86-101; contrast between British and Continental, 131; Christian, 121-134; Marxian, 135-175; State and Municipal, 102-118, 318; as affecting religion and the family, 161-166; ethically, 166-170; wages and distribution of products, 170-175; English origin, 207-210; as "made in Germany," 223-225; numerical strength of, 310, 311; the press of, 312; criticism of, 314-332; impossibility of, 329-332; a calamity, though possible, 330; in America, survey of, 176-202; in England, 203-259; Germany, 260-

275; France, 275-279; Austria, 279-282; Italy, 282-284; Russia, 284-291; Belgium, 291-294; Holland, 294-296; Switzerland, 296-300; Denmark, 300-302; Norway, 302, 303; Sweden, 303-305; Spain and Portugal, 305, 306; Submerges Trade Unionism (England), 248-252; "in the making," 319, 320; personal property and capital under, 322, 323; and the majority, 325, 326; individualism under, 327, 328; the end of, 328, 329; the impossibility of, 331.
Social Democracy of America, 186.
Social Democratic Federation (English), 227-236, 255, 256.
Social Democracy of Germany, 22, 261-274.
Social Party, the, 181.
Socialist Labor Party (American), 183-186.
Socialist Party (American), 186-191.
Solidarity of Labor, 73, 74, 180.
"Solonic Law," 57-59.
Spain, Socialism in, 305, 306.
Spargo, John; on American Socialism, 22; his contempt for Fabianism, 39, 40; on remuneration under Socialism, 46; on Marx's theory of Values, 142; the Gotha Programme, 143, 269; the establishment of Collectivism, 158, 159; English origin of Socialism, 209, 210; the "Iron Law," 267.
Spartan division of land, 54.
Spies, August; Chicago Anarchist, 195, 196.
"State Capitalism," 271; see also State Socialism.
State Socialism, 36, 102-120; in Athens, 56; defined, 104-107; through taxing the rich, 106; Bismarck and, 102; relation of Marxists to, 103; German, 36, 102; British, 36, 106-111; American, 111, 112; President Taft and, 112; in New Zealand, 113; in France; limitations of, 105, 106, 317-320; see also Collectivism.
"Statutes of Laborers," 67-69, 212.
Stead, Alfred, on Socialism in Japan, 60.
Stephens, U. S., founder of K. of L. and A. F. of L., 78.
Street railroads; comparison of American and English, 117-119.
Strikes, in England, 26, 72-75; in Russia, 288; in Belgium, 293; in Sweden, 304; in America, 186, 192-194.
Sun, City of the, Campanella's, 88.
Supernatural, the denial of, 165.
Supreme Court, limitation of power of, 190.
"Surplus Value," 145-148, 208, 217; see also Values.
"Sweated" labor, 67.
Sweden, Socialism in, 303-305.
Switzerland, the "Allmend" in, 61; Socialism in, 296-300.
"Syndicalism," 73, 283.

"Taff Vale Decision," 26, 69-71, 253.
Taft, President, on State Socialism, 112.
Thorne, Will, Socialist M. P., 234.

"Time-basis" of payment, under Socialism, 173-175.
Todt, Pastor, founder of German Protestant Christian Socialism, 132.
"Trades Disputes Act" (English), 27, 69, 71, 72, 75.
Trade and Labor Alliance, Socialist, 85.
Trade Unionism; American compared with English, 26, 27; in ancient days, 58, 59; the "new," 65, 66; and Socialism, 17, 25, 64-85, 178, 202, 239, 240, 244, 248-252, 255, 259, 262, 308; British, 65-74; aggregate of members in the world, 313.
Trusts; see Combinations.
Turkey, Socialism in, 306.
Tyler, Wat, leader of the "Peasants' Revolt," 212, 213.

"Ultimate Aim" of Socialism, 273.
Union, Christian Socialist, 125, 128.
Union, National Labor (American), 76, 77, 179.
Untermann, Ernest, on the establishment of Collectivism, 155, 156; editor of *Capital*, 139.
Utility as the source of Value, 140, 143.
"Utopia," Sir Thomas More's, 87.
Utopian Socialism, 32, 35, 86-101; Romantic, 86-90; Experimental, 90-101.

Values, theory of, 140-148, 217.
Vandervelde, Emil; Belgian Socialist, 309.
Varieties of Socialism, 20-22, 34, 39-42.
Vaughan, Rev. Bernard, on Socialism, 223.
Veblin, Prof. Thorstein; his view of Marxian Socialism, 135.
Villages, communal, 51, 61.
Villiers, Brougham, 207, 210; on condition of English working-class, 215.
Vincent, Henry, the "Demosthenes of Chartism," 220, 221.
Vollmer, George von, a critic of Marx, 272.
"Voyage in Icaria," Cabet's, 88.

Wage, minimum, 67.
Wages, under Socialism, 45-48, 170-175, 269, 270; in feudal times, 67-69.
Wagner, Prof. Adolph, on Rodbertus, 264.
Ward, C. Osborne, on ancient Socialism, 54, 57-59.
Wealth, arrogance of, in America, 28; Labor as source of, 208, 269, 270; State does not produce, 318.
Webb, Sidney, repudiated by Bax, 41; Trade Union writer, 231, 233; as to conditions under Socialism, 326.
Weitling, Wilhelm; Utopian Socialist, 264.
Wells, H. G., 154; on different kinds of Socialism, 41; on conditions under Socialism, 326.
"Welsh Insurrection, The," 221.
Wilson, W. Lawler, on Revolutionary Socialism, 24, 25, 259.

Women, Socialist, 203, 235, 274; in Finland, 291; in Denmark, 301; anti-Socialist, 259.
Workmen's Insurance; German, 103, 104; British, 108; in America, 188.
Workingmen's College (London), 124.
Workingmen's Party (American), 76.

"Zoarites," 36, 99.